

# THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XXXVI

FEBRUARY, 1941

NUMBER 5

---

## Editorial

---

### EDITORIAL CHANGE

So long as both organizations and individuals grow we shall be under the necessity of change. This time it is our capable editor of "Hints for Teachers," Dorothy M. Bell, who has grown into the presidency of Bradford Junior College, at Bradford, Massachusetts, and so finds herself unable to continue as editor.

Miss Bell was appointed Associate Editor of the CLASSICAL JOURNAL in charge of "Hints for Teachers" in 1934, one year before the present editor-in-chief took office, so that he has enjoyed her loyal coöperation continuously for over five years. During those years Miss Bell was a busy, advancing scholar who, notwithstanding her other engagements, found time to visit Roman remains in England, the Greek Isles, and study at the American School at Athens, some of her summers; to teach Latin in the Columbia University Summer Demonstration School, still other summers; but who always kept her finger on the pulse of Latin teachers throughout the whole country.

We are sorry, very sorry, to lose her as an Associate Editor, but congratulate Bradford Junior College upon having induced her to become its president. She is a well-balanced scholar who will, we believe, carry her new responsibilities remarkably well.

We are glad to be able to announce that Miss Bell's place as Editor of "Hints for Teachers" has been accepted by Dr. Grace L. Beede, Assistant Professor of Latin and Greek at the University of South Dakota. Dr. Beede received her A.B. degree at the University of South Dakota, spent one year in graduate study at

Smith College, and was awarded the Ph.D. degree at the University of Chicago in 1936. Her teaching experience, with the exception of one year at Hiwassee Junior College, Madisonville, Tennessee, has been altogether at the University of South Dakota.

She was appointed Vice-President of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South for South Dakota in 1927 and has served with such unusual distinction in that office that in 1939 South Dakota had a higher percentage of increase in membership in our Association than any state in our territory. She has been an important officer in the Classical Round Table of the South Dakota Education Association since 1928 and its president in 1937.

In addition Dr. Beede has that kind of personality that will elicit from all with whom she comes in contact willing and effective coöperation.

Though we regret to lose Miss Bell from our editorial family, we gladly welcome Dr. Beede to our group with the fullest confidence that she will prove a very worthy successor. She takes over the work with this issue.

E. T.

## TWO ROMAN EMPERORS<sup>1</sup>

---

By CHARLES CHRISTOPHER MIEROW  
Carleton College

---

In the long line of Roman rulers of the West from Augustus, the Father of his Country, to the puppet princeling, Romulus Augustulus, there were naturally individuals of great difference in character and ability. The few great emperors stand out against a background of countless petty aspirants for personal fame and power. This is especially true of the closing centuries of the Western Roman Empire.

It is the aim of the present paper to outline the characters, personalities, and achievements of two contrasting figures, as portrayed by a great historian of ancient Rome. To avoid, so far as possible, the danger of coloring the narrative—or our own thinking—by prejudice or favor, I shall follow the example set by Tiberius when he presented before the senate the claims of rival candidates for public office: *subtractis . . . nominibus . . . vitam descripsit*.<sup>2</sup> Doubtless, however, you too, like his hearers, will soon recognize the identity of the emperors we are discussing. I shall also try, like Tacitus, to write *sine ira et studio*.<sup>3</sup> How difficult a task this is the historian himself knew and freely admitted.<sup>4</sup>

So we come to the subject matter of this paper: "Two Roman Emperors."

<sup>1</sup> This paper was written for oral presentation, and the names of the *Two Roman Emperors* are deliberately withheld in the first two sections. It is suggested that the reader refrain from consulting the footnotes until he has completed the biographical sketches contained in this portion of the exposition. This may be done the more readily inasmuch as the rather colorless term "Annals" need not divulge the identity of the ancient author to whom reference is made. Those who prefer to be enlightened at the outset may turn at once to the opening paragraph of section III.

<sup>2</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.* I, 81.

<sup>3</sup> *Ann.* I, 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Ann.* I, 1; II, 73; III, 19.

## I

By the inscrutable decrees of fate, a man who had distinguished himself in his youth by his military achievements, who had afterwards led the greatest Roman army since Actium, and had saved his country in the most serious of all foreign wars since those with Carthage, was called to the throne in his fifty-fifth year.

His first official utterance, after summoning the senate to the *curia*, was brief and modest:<sup>5</sup> he merely assumed the right of paying the last honors to his father; he could not leave his body. The funeral rites alone were discussed at that meeting.<sup>6</sup> When a friend suggested that the oath of allegiance to the new ruler should be renewed annually, the Emperor inquired: "Was that said at my bidding?" The answer was an emphatic denial.<sup>7</sup>

On his accession he expressed the opinion that no one man should assume the entire responsibility of government, particularly in a state that enjoyed the loyal support of so many distinguished citizens.<sup>8</sup> He was importuned to accept the principate. Men reminded him of his notable exploits in war and peace.<sup>9</sup> He seemed the one supremely qualified for so arduous and important a post. Wearied by the apparently unanimous demand, he finally consented.<sup>10</sup> Even then he made no formal acceptance of office, but rather permitted himself to be drafted into service.<sup>11</sup>

He asked proconsular powers for the great soldier who had for three years past been fighting for Rome on the western frontier.<sup>12</sup> When victorious, this man was acclaimed *Imperator* by the Emperor's authorization.<sup>13</sup> He voluntarily bound himself by an oath to maintain old established customs.<sup>14</sup> He sent his own son to a post of danger.<sup>15</sup> To mutinous Roman soldiers he wrote a personal note, reminding them of their previous service in the field together, and promising to redress their wrongs.<sup>16</sup> Yet he issued a warning as well.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>5</sup> *Ann.* (for the identity of the work thus cited from this point onward, see prefatory note) I, 7.      <sup>6</sup> I, 8.      <sup>7</sup> I, 8.

<sup>8</sup> I, 11. See also III, 69 and IV, 15. For his complaints at the dearth of provincial governors, cf. III, 35 and VI, 27.      <sup>9</sup> I, 12.      <sup>10</sup> I, 13.

<sup>11</sup> I, 13.      <sup>12</sup> I, 14.      <sup>13</sup> I, 58 and II, 26. Cf. also III, 74.

<sup>14</sup> I, 14. It is interesting to observe that he used the old republican forms: e.g., IV, 19 and VI, 3.      <sup>15</sup> I, 24.      <sup>16</sup> I, 25.      <sup>17</sup> I, 25.



During his reign he refused to endanger the state by leaving Rome to undertake foreign campaigns in person.<sup>18</sup> When proffered the honorary title of *pater patriae*, he rejected it. He felt oppressed by the uncertainty of human affairs and by the precarious footing of those who climb far above their fellows.<sup>19</sup>

Like all men in high position, he was criticized and assailed in anonymous letters.<sup>20</sup> These he would frequently publish.

When a Roman was accused of forswearing himself by the deity of the Emperor's father, he declared that divinity had not been bestowed on his sire for the destruction of his citizens.<sup>21</sup> He became violently enraged upon learning that the head of a statue of his predecessor in office had been struck off and replaced by his own likeness.<sup>22</sup>

Whenever he attended the courts, many a verdict was recorded on the merits of the case that might otherwise have been the result of influence.<sup>23</sup>

He was a man of generous impulses, eager to spend money in a good cause.<sup>24</sup> Nevertheless he was a shrewd economist.<sup>25</sup>

When he found that his appointees and those of the senate were rendering faithful and efficient service, it was his policy to continue them in office.<sup>26</sup>

We may read of many instances of this Emperor's fairness and impartiality.<sup>27</sup> In a logical and convincing address still on record he cites the arguments against a certain five-year plan of that day.<sup>28</sup>

He appears to have been, by modern standards and in the language of the present, "a hard-headed business man"; he was an

<sup>18</sup> I, 47.      <sup>19</sup> I, 72. Cf. also II, 87.

<sup>20</sup> I, 72. For his attitude toward idle rumors, cf. II, 82; III, 10; VI, 24.

<sup>21</sup> I, 73.      <sup>22</sup> I, 74. Cf. also IV, 31 and IV, 37.

<sup>23</sup> I, 75. Cf. also III, 28, last sentence. Also IV, 22; IV, 31; IV, 36.

<sup>24</sup> *Quam virtutem diu retinuit*, adds the historian (I, 75). For specific examples, cf. II, 42; II, 47; II, 48; IV, 13; IV, 64; IV, 45.

<sup>25</sup> III, 52 and I, 78. For his price-fixing, cf. II, 87. He came to the rescue of the state finances in a time of depression by a subsidy to the banks (VI, 17, end).

<sup>26</sup> I, 80.

<sup>27</sup> E.g., II, 34. Cf. also II, 29; 33; 35; 48; 52; 83; III, 37; 50; 51; 53-54 (his views on prohibition); 56; 69; 70 (refuses to prosecute in a case involving disrespect to himself only; cf. also 76); 71; V, 7; VI, 4 and 30.      <sup>28</sup> II, 36.

able ruler<sup>29</sup> and what is termed "a straight-shooter."<sup>30</sup> In his official capacity, and remembering perhaps his responsibility as the one charged with the duties performed under the republic by the censor, the Emperor exercised control over public morals.<sup>31</sup> He staunchly upheld the simplicity and sobriety of an earlier day.<sup>32</sup> He was scrupulous in observing precedents—particularly in matters concerning religion.<sup>33</sup> Yet he declared: *nec omnia apud priores meliora*. He was a "booster" for his own day and age: a *laudator aevi praesentis*.<sup>34</sup> He dedicated temples and restored public buildings, following thus in the footsteps of the great Augustus, the builder of Rome.<sup>35</sup>

Early in his reign he openly declared his attitude toward the current interpretation of treasonable utterances by saying: *in se iacta nolle ad cognitionem vocari*.<sup>36</sup>

He was a patriotic soldier,<sup>37</sup> an unvacillating ruler,<sup>38</sup> an able statesman and diplomat<sup>39</sup> and a lover of peace.<sup>40</sup> Scornful of sycophants and flatterers<sup>41</sup> he prided himself on his inscrutability.<sup>42</sup>

His personal character was unblemished by the vice of greed.<sup>43</sup> He was generous in his recognition of the achievements of others,<sup>44</sup> judicial in his attitude.<sup>45</sup> He regarded it as the first duty of a ruler that his people should be adequately fed: care for the grain supply was his chief concern.<sup>46</sup>

A man most unfortunate in all of his personal family relations, he had known bitter grief because of the loss of those dearest to him. His rejoicing was, perhaps consequently, the greater when he became grandfather to twin boys.<sup>47</sup> At another time he gave public

<sup>29</sup> Read the speech recorded in Ann. II, 38. The great historian says of him (III, 69): *Atque ille prudens moderandi, si propria ira non impelleretur*.

<sup>30</sup> II, 88; VI, 5 (end).

<sup>31</sup> II, 48; IV, 14. For his general attitude on reforms and reformers cf. III, 54 (end) and IV, 62. <sup>32</sup> III, 60 and 54.

<sup>33</sup> III, 64; IV, 43. But for his sensible attitude toward books of oracles, cf. VI, 12.

<sup>34</sup> III, 55; IV, 16.

<sup>35</sup> II, 49.

<sup>36</sup> II, 50; VI, 38.

<sup>37</sup> Mention has already been made of his own war record. His reaction to a serious rebellion is noteworthy: III, 47. And cf. III, 73. <sup>38</sup> II, 66.

<sup>39</sup> E.g., II, 63 and 65; VI, 32.

<sup>40</sup> II, 64; IV, 32.

<sup>41</sup> III, 47; also III, 65.

<sup>42</sup> III, 44; IV, 71. His silence was frequently misinterpreted: VI, 13.

<sup>43</sup> III, 18. Also I, 75 and II, 48.

<sup>44</sup> III, 21.

<sup>45</sup> III, 10 and 23.

<sup>46</sup> III, 54.

<sup>47</sup> II, 84.

expression to an encomium on his son for exhibiting a father's affection for his nephews.<sup>48</sup>

Upon the death of this cherished son and heir, the Emperor displayed notable courage and devotion to duty.<sup>49</sup> In a dramatic and affecting speech he commended to the senate his grandnephews, the children his son had adopted on the death of their own parent.<sup>50</sup> He sought to find solace for himself in hard work.<sup>51</sup>

Refusing to allow a shrine to be erected to him in a distant province, he declared it to be his chief ambition to be worthy of his ancestry, concerned for his people's welfare, and careless of everything else.<sup>52</sup> *Haec mihi in animis vestris templa*, he said.<sup>53</sup> He prays (in the spirit of a familiar ode of Horace) for *quietam et intellegentem . . . mentem*, and hopes that praise and kindly thoughts may bless his memory when he is gone.

To the one man whom he regarded as his greatest and most loyal friend—and who had demonstrated his devotion by saving the Emperor's life at the risk of his own<sup>54</sup>—he displayed a touching intimacy and affection.<sup>55</sup>

He had a very real interest in literature.<sup>56</sup>

In his later years he became a recluse, going to extremes in his desire for privacy.<sup>57</sup> The responsibilities of his burdensome office, always a source of anxiety and discomfort, grew heavier as he advanced in years. He wrote an interesting and revealing letter to the Senate which discloses his turmoil of spirit.<sup>58</sup> A—to us—unexpected sense of humor must have afforded him some slight comfort.<sup>59</sup> Yet his last days were clouded by a sense of unpopularity and of failure in the great work he had set out to do.<sup>60</sup> His end was tragic in that it might be said of him, *bona iuventae senectus flagitiosa oblitteravit*.<sup>61</sup> Yet he displayed even then a tolerance of freedom in others and a contempt of his own ill fame that are rather surprising under all the circumstances.<sup>62</sup> His aim, we are told, was not so much

<sup>48</sup> iv, 4. For his old-fashioned filial regard for his mother, cf. v, 3.

<sup>49</sup> iv, 8.

<sup>50</sup> iv, 8.

<sup>51</sup> iv, 13.

<sup>52</sup> iv, 38.

<sup>53</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>54</sup> iv, 59.

<sup>55</sup> Read carefully iv, 40. His attitude toward another friend is shown in vi, 26.

<sup>56</sup> iv, 58.

<sup>57</sup> iv, 67. This developed at last into "Romaphobia" (vi, 15, end).

<sup>58</sup> vi, 6.

<sup>59</sup> vi, 2.

<sup>60</sup> vi, 30.

<sup>61</sup> vi, 32. That some, at least, of the stories spread abroad about him were false is indicated in vi, 47.

<sup>62</sup> vi, 38.

to secure the favor of his contemporaries as to merit the praise of posterity.<sup>63</sup>

Just before his death he prophesied certain future happenings with uncanny accuracy: an evidence, perhaps, of his ability to read character.<sup>64</sup> His iron will persisted to the very end: he strove to hide the desperate state of his health by a forced sociability.<sup>65</sup> And so, at last, he died.

## II

So much, then, for the first of our portraits. Contrast with this biographical sketch the personality that follows.

Attaining the supreme power in the state thanks to a woman's wiles and his adoption by a senile emperor,<sup>66</sup> a man of the age-old guile and arrogance characteristic of his house,<sup>67</sup> this ruler seems to have given the historian adequate reason to believe that he hastened his predecessor's death that he himself might make sure of succeeding to the throne.<sup>68</sup> Yet he was shrewd enough to pretend that he had been called and chosen in due form by the State.<sup>69</sup> He was one who had long steeped his mind in bitter wrath, hypocrisy, and vice.<sup>70</sup> The initial act of his principate was the cold-blooded murder of an innocent rival; this crime he justified by pretending it to be the last command of his dead father, the late emperor.<sup>71</sup> Even in his moderation he gave the impression of conceit.<sup>72</sup> Fearful of an uprising against his new authority, he took precautions to preserve order by an elaborate military cortege at his predecessor's funeral.<sup>73</sup> His mother, too, was a harsh stepmother to the State.<sup>74</sup>

There were those who believed that the present emperor's adoptive father, knowing the man's vileness, had sought to enhance his own future glory by a deliberately planned contrast in the two reigns.<sup>75</sup>

Though he was a fluent speaker, his good faith was mistrusted.<sup>76</sup> He was habitually, or perhaps naturally, obscure in utterance "even when he had no wish to conceal his thoughts."<sup>77</sup> He always

<sup>63</sup> VI, 46. It is interesting to compare with this the historian's view of the chief function of history: III, 65. <sup>64</sup> VI, 46. <sup>65</sup> VI, 50. <sup>66</sup> I, 7. <sup>67</sup> I, 4.

<sup>68</sup> I, 5.

<sup>69</sup> I, 7.

<sup>70</sup> I, 4.

<sup>71</sup> I, 6.

<sup>72</sup> I, 8

<sup>73</sup> I, 8.

<sup>74</sup> I, 10.

<sup>75</sup> I, 10.

<sup>76</sup> I, 11.

<sup>77</sup> I, 11.

sought to hide his real feelings—and succeeded.<sup>78</sup> Yet his facial expression was sometimes a danger signal.<sup>79</sup>

He had an incurably suspicious mind.<sup>80</sup> However, he often veiled his more lasting grudges by silence.<sup>81</sup> He was jealous of his mother's popularity.<sup>82</sup> He was an austere man, and inclined to withstand the pampered populace of the capital.<sup>83</sup> His inherent jealousy made him suspicious of the motives of all the great or outstanding men and women of his time.<sup>84</sup> A trusted but unworthy and treacherous minister played upon his fears and poisoned his mind.<sup>85</sup> Beneath his pose of democratic freedom men saw the tyrant, quick to punish treasonable act or utterance.<sup>86</sup>

When told that his character had been assailed, he assumed the truth of the charges from a consciousness of his own vileness, and punished the accused persons under the *lex maiestatis*.<sup>87</sup> Even when the Emperor acted justly he was harsh.<sup>88</sup>

His secretiveness led him even to forbid the Sibylline Books to be consulted: *perinde divina humanaque obtegens*.<sup>89</sup> It was perhaps this same instinctive love for ways that are dark which led him to attack his enemies, his rivals, or the objects of his jealousy preferably by underhand methods.<sup>90</sup> In short, he was a thoroughgoing hypocrite.<sup>91</sup>

As regards judicial procedure, while he did not venture to act in opposition to existing statutes, he evaded the spirit of the law, *callidus et novi iuris repertor*.<sup>92</sup>

This emperor had his own circle of flatterers,<sup>93</sup> but the populace as a whole, and in particular the Senate, were hostile to him.<sup>94</sup> Even when he distributed largess to the crowds he was not credited with real affection for his people.<sup>95</sup>

<sup>78</sup> *Loc. cit.*, and cf. also I, 33.

<sup>79</sup> E.g., I, 12 and IV, 34. For his more customary "poker face" cf. II, 29.

<sup>80</sup> I, 13. <sup>81</sup> E.g., I, 13. Also I, 24; III, 22; IV, 53 (end).

<sup>82</sup> I, 14; III, 64; V, 2. <sup>83</sup> I, 54 (end).

<sup>84</sup> I, 69; II, 5; II, 26 (end); IV, 67; VI, 46. <sup>85</sup> I, 69 (end).

<sup>86</sup> I, 72 (end); I, 73; IV, 19; VI, 39. <sup>87</sup> I, 74.

<sup>88</sup> I, 75. <sup>89</sup> I, 76. <sup>90</sup> E.g., II, 5; II, 42.

<sup>91</sup> II, 28; IV, 31; III, 16; III, 22 (end); IV, 4; VI, 1. Of this Emperor's grandson the historian writes (VI, 45): *simulationum . . . falsa in sinu avi perdidicerat*.

<sup>92</sup> II, 30. <sup>93</sup> II, 38. <sup>94</sup> *Loc. cit.* and III, 44. <sup>95</sup> II, 42.

He feared and suspected his own sons.<sup>96</sup> He rejoiced when he found the Senate divided between his sons and the laws:<sup>97</sup> in such a situation he had personally everything to gain and nothing to lose.

In his diplomacy with foreign powers the Emperor likewise chose to use guile.<sup>98</sup>

One of the secrets of absolutism, handed down from the days of Augustus, was to keep a firm grip on Egypt, the granary of the Empire; accordingly this ruler also prohibited all senators or knights of the higher rank from entering that ancient land. When one of his generals disobeyed this prohibition, he was severely censured.<sup>99</sup> Not long after, the offender met his death by poison.<sup>100</sup> There seemed reason to believe that the Emperor himself had ordered the assassination.<sup>101</sup>

Such was his conceit that he turned even accidental happenings into an occasion for self-praise.<sup>102</sup> Nevertheless, he detested flattery.<sup>103</sup>

A man utterly without pity,<sup>104</sup> he was tireless in stimulating informers to bring noble Romans to their death.<sup>105</sup> Particularly horrible was his calculating deliberation: he was implacable and unhurried—*ohne Hast doch ohne Rast*.<sup>106</sup> He would cherish a grudge over a period of years.<sup>107</sup> He encouraged delation by lavish rewards for informers.<sup>108</sup>

In his old age he devoted all his time to deeds of cruelty and lust, neglecting affairs of state for this purpose.<sup>109</sup> He appropriated for himself wealth confiscated by the government—including gold-mines!<sup>110</sup> His last days were a veritable Reign of Terror.<sup>111</sup> His hypocrisy and his cruelty outlasted his bodily strength.<sup>112</sup> At the age of seventy-eight he died—or perhaps was murdered.<sup>113</sup>

### III

What I am attempting to do is by now doubtless clear to all. I have presented as though in parallel columns two contrasting—

<sup>96</sup> II, 44. For his later attitude toward his young nephews, cf. IV, 17.

<sup>97</sup> II, 51. <sup>98</sup> E.g., II, 66. <sup>99</sup> II, 69. <sup>100</sup> II, 71 and 72.

<sup>101</sup> See the last note; also II, 77 (end). <sup>102</sup> II, 84. <sup>103</sup> II, 87.

<sup>104</sup> III, 15; III, 51; III, 67. <sup>105</sup> I, 38 (first sentence).

<sup>106</sup> IV, 11; IV, 42; IV, 70. <sup>107</sup> IV, 29. <sup>108</sup> IV, 30. <sup>109</sup> IV, 57; 67; VI, 1.

<sup>110</sup> VI, 19. <sup>111</sup> VI, 19; 24; 39 and 40. <sup>112</sup> VI, 50. <sup>113</sup> *Loc. cit.*



perhaps I should rather say conflicting—accounts of one and the same man. Yet every statement I have made, whether pro or con, is from a single source, the *Annals* of Tacitus. This paper might have been called: "Tiberius, The Tale of Two Emperors."

The confusion prevalent in modern times concerning the character of the Emperor Tiberius is not solely, or even chiefly, due to the glaring contrast between the laudatory account given by his loyal adherent, Velleius Paterculus, a contemporary who had served under Tiberius for eight consecutive years, with the treatment accorded him by later writers of antiquity. It is in no small measure the consequence of the somewhat baffling portrait of the man as delineated by the greatest ancient historian of Rome.

I am not of the company of those to whom one of the leading classical scholars of our time would refer as "Tacitomastiges." I am not trying to impugn the sincerity of Tacitus. I am not accusing him of falsehood. So far as matters of fact are concerned, he has—as I have tried to make clear in the preceding pages—recorded both favorable and unfavorable matters with equal accuracy and frankness.

It is only when he essays to probe into *motives* that Tacitus is at fault. Here he is led astray by his bias toward the old days of the free Republic. The underlying assumption of his political philosophy is that the Roman Empire represents a distinct backward step in government. He has had personal experience—under Domitian—of the oppression and cruelty of a tyrant. This naturally has its effect on his appraisal of earlier rulers. He is always ready to believe the worst of them. When there are opposite possibilities as to actuating principles, the *laudator temporis acti* is inclined to give little credit for sincerity to a dictator who speaks like a defender of freedom.

Perhaps Tacitus himself was sometimes conscious of a failure on his part to give due credit to a man like Tiberius for honorable intentions and for worthy achievement. If so, his own words (spoken in another connection) are capable of application to himself: *dum vetera extollimus recentium incuriosi*.<sup>114</sup> His thesis is that the times are out of joint and the world has been turned upside

<sup>114</sup> II, 88.



down.<sup>115</sup> He finds it difficult, therefore, to believe that an emperor might sincerely desire the welfare and even the freedom of his people.

Consequently, though he records the reluctance of Tiberius to assume the responsibilities of the principate and declares that Tiberius *cuncta per consules incipiebat, tamquam vetere re publica et ambiguus imperandi*,<sup>116</sup> he cannot bring himself to believe that there was not an ulterior motive for this. His own mind suggests one. "It was realized later," he says, "that his coyness had been assumed with the further object of gaining an insight into the feelings of the aristocracy: for all the while he was distorting words and looks into crimes and storing them in his memory."<sup>117</sup>

Now it is precisely such statements by the historian that tend to distort our own judgment on the character of Tiberius. That is why, in the first part of this paper, I have tried to set down merely the testimony which Tacitus gives as to the *facts* of the Emperor's life without his own surmises or interpretations.

It is startling to observe how much of the unfavorable impression one has of the Emperor Tiberius is due to innuendo on the part of the writer. Time after time we are given a choice of motives to account for some fine action which the Emperor has indisputably performed. Take, for example, the matter of continuing in office men of proved worth.<sup>118</sup> This, apparently, is evidence of good judgment and wisdom on the part of Tiberius. But Tacitus suggests several possible ulterior motives: (1) mere following of the path of least resistance, or (2) dislike of having too many separate individuals in positions of authority, or (3) a deliberate policy of keeping only *mediocre* men in office, on the theory that *ex optimis periculum sibi, a pessimis dedecus publicum metuebat*.<sup>119</sup> Again, at the time of Sacrovir's rebellion, Tiberius admittedly showed a courageous unconcern;<sup>120</sup> either, says Tacitus, "from deep reserve or because he had information that the disturbances were of moderate extent and slighter than reported."<sup>121</sup> When Tiberius rejects the

<sup>115</sup> I, 4.      <sup>116</sup> I, 7.

<sup>117</sup> I, 7 (last sentence). I have quoted the translation by John Jackson printed in the "Loeb Classical Library."  
<sup>118</sup> I, 80.      <sup>119</sup> *Loc. cit.*      <sup>120</sup> III, 44.

<sup>121</sup> *Loc. cit.* (Jackson's translation).

divine honors urged upon him, Tacitus, after reporting the Emperor's speech, declares that his attitude was "by some interpreted as modesty, by many as self-distrust, by a few as degeneracy of soul."<sup>122</sup> These are but a few typical examples.<sup>123</sup>

Aside from these instances of the attribution of base motives for conduct in itself admirable, we find the frequent use of innuendo. Of the inaugural address, in which Tiberius expresses republican sentiments, Tacitus remarks: *Plus in oratione tali dignitatis quam fidei erat.*<sup>124</sup> When the Emperor contributes the sum of one hundred million sesterces for the rebuilding of the area swept by a great fire in Rome, the historian's comment is: *quod damnum Caesar in gloriam vertit.*<sup>125</sup> And after quoting a very reasonable speech by Tiberius wherein he points out the undemocratic tendency of a suggestion that at the elections magistrates be chosen five years in advance, Tacitus says: *Favorabili in speciem oratione vim imperii tenuit.*<sup>126</sup>

## IV

To those whose impression of Tiberius is due to a merely cursory reading of the *Annals* it might appear that the verdict pronounced upon him by the great historian of the Empire was summed up in the words: *saevitiam quam paenitentiam maluit.*<sup>127</sup> A more careful consideration of the actual content of this work must convince us, however, that this is not the case. "*Ut odium et gratia desiere, ius valuit.*"<sup>128</sup>

There is contained in the *Annals* of Tacitus much evidence for facts utterly at variance with the aura of suspicion by which the lines of the Emperor's figure have too long been clouded as by miasmatic vapors. Rightly understood, Tiberius is one of the most

<sup>122</sup> IV, 38 (end) (Jackson's translation). Tacitus adds by way of explanation: *contemptu famae contemni virtutes.*

<sup>123</sup> For other instances of a choice of motives offered by Tacitus for the Emperor's conduct, cf. *Ann.* I, 62; III, 3; 14; 22; VI, 38. <sup>124</sup> I, 11.

<sup>125</sup> VI, 45. Oddly enough, in the same passage Tacitus refers to the Emperor's *contemptu ambitionis.*

<sup>126</sup> II, 36 (end). See also the following passages for similar innuendo or explicit accusation: I, 11; 13; 46; 52; 53; 75; 77; 81; II, 38; 87; 88; III, 8; 44; 49-51; 69; IV, 30; 55; 57; 60; 70; 71; 74; V, 3; VI, 6; 27. <sup>127</sup> VI, 23.

<sup>128</sup> VI, 26, where the words are uttered, however, in an entirely different connection.

tragic figures in all Roman history. Tacitus himself makes this clear to us. Let us consider some of the significant things that Tacitus, in his capacity of historian, has said about this man.

Tiberius was born under an unlucky star.<sup>129</sup> His mother had been taken from her husband by Augustus.<sup>130</sup> His father, a political exile, carried the young boy about with him on his wanderings.<sup>131</sup> When Tiberius afterwards entered the imperial palace, it was as a stepson. From the outset he had the envy, the fear, the hatred of many rivals to contend with.<sup>132</sup>

He was happily married.<sup>133</sup> Then Augustus forced him to divorce his beloved wife in order to espouse his own daughter Julia, previously twice married<sup>134</sup> and notorious for her infidelities.<sup>135</sup> She exerted a baleful influence over Tiberius from the first: *maxime in lubrico egit*, says Tacitus.<sup>136</sup> He finally sought a means of escape by going into voluntary exile to the island of Rhodes: *nec alia tam in-tima Tiberio causa, cur Rhodum abscederet*.<sup>137</sup> Here he was flouted, slighted, forgotten. His very life was not safe.<sup>138</sup>

Upon his eventual return to Rome he was for twelve years master of an imperial house that lacked an heir.<sup>139</sup> All this preceded his long reign—from his fifty-fifth to his seventy-eighth year.

As compared with a *quinquennium Neronis*, Tacitus credits Tiberius with at least nine years of good government.<sup>140</sup> One is tempted, at this point, to quote from the fulsome tribute of Velleius<sup>141</sup> at least a few sentences by way of contrast with the faint praise elsewhere accorded the Emperor Tiberius. His motto seems to have been: *Principes mortales, rem publicam aeternam*.<sup>142</sup> It is true that to quote from so partisan a source might distract our attention from the account we are considering—the *Annals* of Tacitus. But consider the tribute paid to his just government. Public affairs under this tyrant were treated in the Senate. There was freedom of speech. Appointments to office were made on the basis

<sup>129</sup> VI, 51.

<sup>130</sup> V, 1.

<sup>131</sup> VI, 51.

<sup>132</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>133</sup> To Vipsania. Cf. the touching incident related by Suetonius, *Tiber.* VII, 3.

<sup>134</sup> First to M. Marcellus, then to M. Vipsanius Agrippa.

<sup>135</sup> VI, 51.

<sup>136</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>137</sup> I, 53.

<sup>138</sup> Cf. I, 4; II, 42. Suetonius gives a detailed account of the eight years at Rhodes (*op. cit.*, X-XIV).

<sup>139</sup> VI, 51.

<sup>140</sup> To 23 A.D. Cf. *Ann.* IV, 1.

<sup>141</sup> E.g., Velleius Paterculus, II, 126; 129-131.

<sup>142</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.* III, 6.

of merit. The chief steps in the old *cursus honorum* still had their ancient prestige. The laws were in force. Companies of Roman knights were in charge of the revenues. The imperial property was under the control of tried agents of known integrity who were continued in office indefinitely. The first care of the Emperor was for the people's food supply. The provinces were wisely governed. Cruel punishments had been abolished. Any dispute between the Emperor and a private citizen was decided by a court of law.

Does this seem too flattering a picture to win credence? "All this," says the historian—and it is not from Velleius that I have been quoting, but from Tacitus<sup>143</sup>—"All this he did, not gracefully indeed, but in his grim and often dreaded fashion."<sup>144</sup>

It is from this point, the year 23 A.D., that Tacitus dates a deterioration in the character of Tiberius.<sup>145</sup> He records the successive steps in his downfall, attributable (1) to the murder of his son, of which he says, *Neque quisquam scriptor tam infensus extitit, ut Tiberio obiectaret, cum omnia alia conquirent intenderentque*;<sup>146</sup> (2) the influence of his false friend Sejanus (for he writes of the tyranny of Tiberius, *Initium et causa penes Aelium Seianum*);<sup>147</sup> (3) the discovery of this friend's treachery;<sup>148</sup> (4) the death of his mother.<sup>149</sup>

By way of summary, in the concluding chapter of the sixth book of the *Annals*<sup>150</sup> Tacitus lists five ages of Tiberius—distinct epochs in the development of his character. He gives him credit for nobility of life and reputation until his accession to the throne.<sup>151</sup> Then followed what the historian refers to in retrospect as "an inscrutable and disingenuous period of hypocritical virtues."<sup>152</sup> In his third phase, Tiberius was a mixture of good and bad, so long as his mother still lived.<sup>153</sup> Then followed the last two stages: one of cruelty, while under the influence of Sejanus,<sup>154</sup> and —last scene of all—crime and ignominy.<sup>155</sup>

<sup>143</sup> IV, 6.      <sup>144</sup> IV, 7.      <sup>145</sup> IV, 6.      <sup>146</sup> IV, 11.

<sup>147</sup> IV, 1. Cf. also IV, 41; 54; 68-70; VI, 8; IV, 59 (last sentence).

<sup>148</sup> VI, 38. It is worthy of note that the trials for treason recorded by Tacitus in *Ann.* VI are mainly those of friends of Sejanus; cf. VI, 14 and 19 and opening sentences of VI, 38.      <sup>149</sup> V, 3. Also VI, 51.      <sup>150</sup> VI, 51.      <sup>151</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>152</sup> Jackson's translation, VI, 51: *occultum ac subdolum fingendis virtutibus.*

<sup>153</sup> *Loc. cit.*      <sup>154</sup> *Loc. cit.*      <sup>155</sup> *Loc. cit.*

To offset this dismal descent into the abyss we have the explicit assurance of Tacitus (1) that Tiberius was always something of a puzzle to all who knew him;<sup>156</sup> (2) that he was nobody's fool;<sup>157</sup> and (3) that he was popular and beloved by the people even in his old age.<sup>158</sup> Good men might live to a ripe old age, even under Tiberius.<sup>159</sup> Thus the biography actually appears to list more creditable than it does base deeds.

## V

What can be said for the historian who presents such conflicting pictures of one and the same man? This, I think: First, that he did "without hatred or favor" present the facts in the life of the Emperor Tiberius. He uses for the most part dependable sources. He permits the ruler to speak for himself and quotes long addresses and excerpts from letters and other messages.<sup>160</sup> It is on these parts of the record in the *Annals* that the favorable account of Tiberius presented in the first section of this paper is based.<sup>161</sup>

Yet Tacitus is a man heart-sick at the loss of the ancient Roman freedom. He was absolutely convinced that *populi imperium iuxta libertatem (est)*.<sup>162</sup> The Empire seemed to him a ghastly mockery of this freedom.<sup>163</sup> He is inescapably predisposed against it as an institution. At times he is almost inclined to believe in astrological teachings and conclude that perhaps, after all, there is no such thing as human freedom at all.<sup>164</sup> Peoples and princes alike may be puppets in the hands of fate.

At all events, imperial majesty *cui maior e longinquo reverentia*<sup>165</sup> is a thing to sneer at. Kings cannot tolerate equality.<sup>166</sup> How few have the virtues which he particularly prizes in those placed in positions of authority: *prompti aditus, obvia comitas*.<sup>167</sup> Tiberius certainly was notably lacking in these qualities.

<sup>156</sup> IV, 1.

<sup>157</sup> IV, 11: Quis enim mediocri prudentia, nedum Tiberius tantis rebus exercitus.

<sup>158</sup> Cf. IV, 64 and VI, 45.

<sup>159</sup> VI, 39 (Poppaeus Sabinus).

<sup>160</sup> E.g., *Ann.* I, 11; 25; II, 36; 38; 65; 83; III, 6; 12; 35; 47; 53 f.; 71; IV, 8; 16; 37 f.; 40; VI, 3; 6.

<sup>161</sup> Pp. 1-7 above.

<sup>162</sup> VI, 42, where Tacitus is speaking, however, of Oriental affairs.

<sup>163</sup> III, 18.

<sup>164</sup> IV, 20; cf. also IV, 58 and VI, 20-22.

<sup>165</sup> I, 47.

<sup>166</sup> II, 42 (spoken of King Archelaus).

<sup>167</sup> II, 2 (of Vonones).



Hence it is perhaps only natural that Tacitus illustrates the familiar saying of Julius Caesar that *fere libenter homines id quod volunt credunt*.<sup>168</sup> He admits this weakness when he says: *Facilius crediderim*.<sup>169</sup> Too frequently, as we have seen, he puts the worst possible construction on the acts of Tiberius. Indeed, he goes so far as to say, when relating the bloodlust shown by Drusus and censured by his father, Tiberius, who absented himself from the gladiatorial games: *Non crediderim ad ostentandam saevitiam movendasque populi offensiones concessam filio materiem*.<sup>170</sup> "I should be slow to believe" that, remarks Tacitus. And we seem to hear our old friend Horace murmur, *hic niger est, hunc tu, Romane, caveto!*<sup>171</sup> It sounds suspiciously like the *aerugo mera* that genial satirist so greatly deplores.<sup>172</sup>

Tacitus quite properly—and very explicitly—discredits, on principle, gossip and rumor as a historical source.<sup>173</sup> And yet, how often he reports what "they say" as regards ulterior motives for the Emperor's conduct. He cites an *occultus rumor*.<sup>174</sup> He uses such terms as *nec dubium habebat*,<sup>175</sup> *credidere quidam*,<sup>176</sup> *neque dubitantur praescripta ei a Tiberio*.<sup>177</sup> We even find the confession, *set non omiserim eorundem temporum rumorem, validum*.<sup>178</sup> It is true that in this instance the historian then proceeds to demolish the rumor: *quod nullo auctore certo firmanetur, prompte refutaveris*.<sup>179</sup> But the harm has been done, and one wonders why Tacitus referred to such a libel at all.

Probably the true, as well as the kindest explanation of the attitude of Tacitus, is his conception of the chief function of a historian: "to insure the commemoration of virtuous acts and set before base utterance and deed the fear of the detestation of posterity."<sup>180</sup> Quite properly he detests the horrors of the *lex maiestatis*.<sup>181</sup> Associating Tiberius with some of its most cruel manifestations, he finds it impossible to credit him with any but the basest motives,

<sup>168</sup> B.G. III, 18.<sup>169</sup> Cf. Ann. III, 3.<sup>170</sup> I, 76 (end). Cf. also III, 16.<sup>171</sup> Horace, *Sermones* I, 4, 85.<sup>172</sup> *Loc. cit.*, vs. 101.<sup>173</sup> Read carefully the last sentence in IV, 11.<sup>174</sup> II, 55 (end).<sup>175</sup> II, 43.<sup>176</sup> *Loc. cit.*<sup>177</sup> III, 8.<sup>178</sup> IV, 10.<sup>179</sup> IV, 11; and see the concluding sentence of the chapter.<sup>180</sup> III, 65: *praecipuum munus annalium reor ne virtutes sileantur utque pravis dictis factisque ex posteritate et infamia metus sit.*<sup>181</sup> Cf. II, 27-32.

even for worthy actions. He regards him as a man paralyzed by power: *vi dominationis convulsus et mutatus*.<sup>182</sup> His very virtues seemed to count against him: how could a man so unappreciative of renown as to refuse deification be deserving of it—or in any degree righteous: *contemptu famae contemni virtutes*.<sup>183</sup> When he shakes off his obsession of determinism as an active and inescapable force, Tacitus believes in the permanence of ideas and the eternity of great deeds.<sup>184</sup>

The monotony of the history of the emperors appalls him: *saeva iussa, continuas accusationes, fallaces amicitias, perniciem innocentium*.<sup>185</sup> With the reign of Domitian still fresh in his memory, he naturally conceives of Tiberius as that emperor's prototype and example.

Such a man, Tacitus believes, must have been the prey of remorse: *Quippe Tiberium non fortuna, non solitudines protegebant, quin tormenta pectoris suasque ipse poenas fateretur*.<sup>186</sup> So he proceeds to attribute to this cause practically all the anxieties and all the turmoil of spirit to which an executive is subject. He also believes that he must see behind every act, however prepossessing in outward appearance, at least the possibility of a base motive. He misses as subject matter for his history the great events of the days of the free Republic: *nobis in arto et inglorius labor*, he complains.<sup>187</sup>

So Tiberius becomes in the historian's thought the symbol of autocracy. Tacitus could not say, with Marcus Terentius, *Nec quemquam exemplo adsumo*.<sup>188</sup> He does take Tiberius as his text—Exhibit A—in his case against tyranny.

Yet his essential fairness obliges him to admit that Tiberius . . . *imaginem antiquitatis senatui praebebat*.<sup>189</sup>

Perhaps the high spot in the reign of Tiberius, in the opinion of Tacitus,<sup>190</sup> was the occasion on which the senatorial provinces officially presented their claims at Rome and the Senate was, for the time being at least, *libero, ut quondam, quid firmaret mutaretve*.<sup>191</sup> Had there been more such occasions, perhaps the portrait of Tiberius in the *Annals* would have been drawn in clearer lines, less obscured by the distorting veil of interpretation.

<sup>182</sup> VI, 48.<sup>183</sup> IV, 38.<sup>184</sup> IV, 35 (last sentence).<sup>185</sup> IV, 33.<sup>186</sup> VI, 6.<sup>187</sup> IV, 32.<sup>188</sup> VI, 8.<sup>189</sup> II, 60.<sup>190</sup> II, 60: Magnaque eius diei species fuit.<sup>191</sup> *Loc. cit.*



## ROMAN ELEMENTS IN CICERO'S PANEGYRIC ON THE *LEGIO MARTIA*<sup>1</sup>

By J. C. PLUMPE

Josephinum College, Worthington, Ohio

One of the most recent and most successful attempts to account for the ascendancy and supremacy of ancient Rome was presented by Richard Heinze (†1929) in his famous inaugural address as president of the University of Leipzig.<sup>2</sup> Historians from Polybius to Mommsen had endeavored to solve the problem by stressing this or that unique Roman institution. Others, following the example of the philosopher Posidonius, had emphasized certain moral qualities of the people—the *Romani mores antiqui*. But Heinze chose to be routed over ways paved by the modern psychology of personality and to seek the ultimate explanation for Roman greatness "in the whole structure of the Roman soul."

For the purpose of this paper it is important to refer to a noteworthy means of inquiry Heinze recommended by way of introduction to his psychological approach: the judicious "reading" of a Latin lexicon.<sup>3</sup> Many words and expressions, properly of a moral, religious, or political coinage, need only to be seen apart from the faded and changed signification they convey in our modern-language vocabularies, and understood in their full original sense, to serve as invaluable testimonials for the thinking and ways of even those early Romans of whom we have neither written nor traditionary record that is reliable. His famous articles on *auc-*

<sup>1</sup> Read in part at the seventeenth annual meeting of the Ohio Classical Conference, Columbus, Oct. 28, 1938.

<sup>2</sup> *Von den Ursachen der Grösse Roms*<sup>4</sup> (address delivered Oct. 31, 1921): Leipzig, Teubner (1934).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *op. cit.*, 5 f.; 9: Ein unschätzbares Hilfsmittel ist das lateinische Lexikon, wenn man es recht zu lesen weiss.

*toritas* and *fides*<sup>4</sup> illustrate what he had in mind. But these words are only two of a large number of Latin abstracts, the proper understanding and rendering of which forever disconcert the Latin student and scholar as well—"Roman character-words" they have been quite appositely called.<sup>5</sup>

Obviously such words abound in the speeches of Cicero. If to illustrate our point the panegyric on the Martian legion in the *Fourteenth Philippic* (29-35) has been chosen, it is for these two reasons: First, the selection is a speech in itself, a brief compact unit of not more than two and one-half pages of Oxford text. Secondly: though the entire rhetoric and the technical structure of a Ciceronian oration quite evidently are Greek, the subject matter hardly ever owes to actual borrowings from Greek oratory.<sup>6</sup> Only the little *laudatio legionis Martiae*, exposed as it was to an intensive investigation of the Athenian funeral addresses, the so-called *ἐπιτάφιοι λόγοι*, failed to escape a tagging and citation. Passages in it supposedly have been taken by Cicero from the *ἐπιτάφιοι* of Pseudo-Lysias, Pseudo-Demosthenes, Pericles as reported by Thucydides, and from the *Menexenus* of Plato.<sup>7</sup> It will be to our purpose to consider some of the characteristically Roman elements that even it contains.

To state the situation briefly: Cicero spoke the *Fourteenth* and last extant *Philippic* in the Senate on the 21st of April, 43, after a report had reached the capital that Antony had been defeated (April 15th) in the second of two engagements on the Via Aemilia near Forum Gallorum. Cicero vigorously supports the motion of P. Servilius calling for a *supplicatio*. But arguing that this would

<sup>4</sup> In *Hermes* LX (1925), 348-366 and LXIV (1929), 140-166. Both articles are now readily accessible in E. Burck's edition of Heinze's selected essays: *Vom Geist des Römerturns*, Leipzig, Teubner (1938), 1-24 and 25-58. References in this paper are to the latter printing. <sup>5</sup> By W. H. Alexander, "De Imperio," *Class. Bull.* xiv (1938), 41.

<sup>6</sup> Even the collection of Greek commonplaces employed by Cicero appears small: cf. R. Preiswerk, "Griechische Gemeinplätze in Ciceros Reden," in *Juvenes dum sumus*: Basel, Lichtenhahn (1907), 27-38.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. J. Mesk, "Ciceros Nachruf an die Legio Martia," *Wien Stud.* xxvi (1904), 228-234; R. Preiswerk, *De Inventionem Orationum Ciceronianarum*: Basel, Reinhardt (1905), 71 f.; J. R. King, *Philippic Orations*<sup>2</sup>: New York, Oxford University Press (1878), 340-342. The subject is ignored in the annotated edition of B. Mosca, *Filippica* xiv: Naples, Perrella (1934), 36-42.

involve declaring Antony—at long last—a public enemy, the aging *pater patriae* asks for good measure: that the feast be extended to the unprecedented length of fifty days. He concludes with a eulogy for the Martian legionaries, most of whom had perished at Forum Gallorum.

The opening sentence reads: *Est autem fidei pietatisque nostrae declarare fortissimis militibus quam memores simus quamque grati*: "But now it is the part of our *fides* and *pietas* to show our valiant *fides* soldiers how gratefully we remember them." The word *fides* at once confronts us with a directive of Roman life and society as important as it is difficult to understand. This is made strikingly evident when we study the thirty long columns the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* gives it.

Consulting Harper's *Latin Dictionary*, s.v., we find these first general equivalents for *fides*: "trust in a person or thing, faith, confidence, reliance, credence, belief." E. Fraenkel's article appearing in the *Thesaurus* and the observations later published by him<sup>8</sup> show conclusively that the trust-belief compass of meanings is of comparatively recent date, first occurring in the *Auctor ad Herennium* and in Cicero's *De Inventione*. The dictionaries reflect an over-zealous attempt to find in oldest Latinity what had been regarded as originating with Christianity. The second group of meanings in Harper's, called transferred meanings, to wit: "the quality that produces confidence in a person, trustworthiness, faithfulness, conscientiousness, credibility, honesty," corresponds to what Fraenkel finds as the regular range of signification during the republican era.

Here Heinze enters, showing from a study of Latin texts and Roman institutions that *fides* is practically an amalgam of corresponding elements in the two series of meanings quoted. It is neither solely an *actio fidendi, credendi*, etc., nor is it solely a *causa fidendi, credendi*. It invariably carries a dual implication, it is bi-polar, requiring at least two persons: *alicui fides est* || *apud aliquem* (Heinze 28). *Fides* therefore—to take one of the English equivalents given above—is not "confidence," but a "relationship of confidence," *Vertrauensverhältnis*, as Heinze puts it (27).

<sup>8</sup> "Zur Geschichte des Wortes *Fides*," in *Rhein. Mus.* LXXI (1916), 187–199.

Similarly, there is no *fides* which is purely subjective reliance or trust, no *fides* which is wholly objective reliability or trustworthiness.

To illustrate by the word last mentioned, "trustworthiness": Heinze shows very clearly (38) that there is no trustworthiness unless it be recognized trustworthiness. A person owes its presence to something in his personality that is seen by others; and the degree of trustworthiness depends on how it is measured by others. Thus *fides* becomes a very real possession, as is particularly apparent from Plautus, who frequently pairs it in the sense of "credit" with *res*, "property," *genus*, "family, stock," etc.

In his article on *auctoritas* Heinze has demonstrated how deeply ingrained in Roman character it was to seek advice in all situations from those qualified to give it, called *auctores*. The part *fides* played in Roman private and public life becomes evident if we consider a typically Roman institution such as *clientela*, "clientage." Individuals as well as whole communities and territories gave their interests in trust to a man of influence, the *patronus*. A similar relationship of *fides* existed between the magistrates and their subjects.<sup>9</sup>

Now, the *Fourteenth Philippic* is spoken in the Senate. The *fides pietasque nostra* at the beginning of the eulogy is *fides pietasque senatus*. The members of the Senate were for the greatest part ex-magistrates, men who had held curule offices or the tribuneship, men therefore who *de facto* owed their senatorial office to the ballot, the *suffragium populi*. To this *populus Romanus* they were bound by the highest kind of *fides*. In their exercise of Roman government and determination of Roman policies they were furthering the *res publica*, the *res populi* entrusted to them, to their *fides*; and from these considerations too, it would seem, new light is shed upon the formulary phrase *senatus populusque Romanus*.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Heinze, "Fides," 39-41; 47-50; 54 f. Cf. the article "Clientes" by A. v. Premerstein, Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encycl.* vii, 23-35; on Cicero's clientage, G. Boissier, *Cicero and His Friends* (transl. by A. D. Jones): New York, Putnam (1898), 113-122.—The Senate instructed a magistrate always to act *ita ut ei e re publica fideque sua videretur*, a standing formula with which, incidentally, the *Third Philippic* ends. Other instances of the formula are found in *Thes. L. L.* vi, 679.

<sup>10</sup> For *res publica*=*res populi* cf. Heinze, *Von den Ursachen* . . . , 10-13; also the dissertation of R. Stark, *Res Publica*: Göttingen, Dieterichsche Universitäts-Buchdruckerei (1937).

The *res populi* at this time was in grave peril. A state of civil turmoil, a *tumultus*, had been declared early in February, 43. The soldiers of the Martian legion, all but wiped out in the first engagement at Forum Gallorum, and those of the fourth legion, who had fought at the second, had offered their lives to save the *patria*, *senatoribus fideicommissa*. It had been to the best interests of this *fideicommissum* for the Senate to promise rewards to veterans and recruits who took up arms for the loyalist cause; and it was equally incumbent upon *senatus fides*—the phrase so occurs in §§30 and 35—to redeem these promises, to show *quam memores simus*, as Cicero words it.

To show *quamque grati simus* was ordained by *pietas senatus*. *pietas* But *pietas* binds every member of the Roman *societas civium*. It is interesting to note how in the few paragraphs under consideration, besides the Senate, all the other *dramatis personae* are so involved: Apostrophizing the fallen legionaries in §32, he refers to those whom they had slain as *impii*, punished *ad inferos*, while they themselves (distinguished by *summa militum pietas*: 6) have attained to the *piorum sedes et locus*. In §35 it is stated that the monument proposed will bear testimony of *populi Romani pietas*. And then there is Antony, guilty of the basest crime against *pietas*, the crime of *parricidium*, the murder of free Roman citizens, and treason (35).<sup>11</sup>

This is true Roman piety: *Pium esse est filium esse*, "to be pious is to be a son," *fromm sein heisst Sohn sein*, as a modern poet and thinker states in a chapter on Vergil's *pius Aeneas*,<sup>12</sup> and Roman *pietas* in its highest form is *patriae filium esse*. The sentence in the *First Catilinarian* (17) comes to mind: *Patria . . . communis est parens omnium nostrum*; and it is little wonder that in one of Cicero's definitions of *pietas* the *patria* precedes even the *parentes*, as the objects of *pietas* are enumerated.<sup>13</sup>

For the Roman there was no *pietas* if not manifested externally. There was no piety wholly resident in the inner man. *Pietas erga*

<sup>11</sup> On *civium parricidium* cf. Cicero, *In Cat.* i, 29; *patriae parricidium*, Cic., *Phil.* ii, 17; xi, 29. Catiline's followers are *parricidae rei publicae*: Sallust, *Cat. Coni.* 51, 25.

<sup>12</sup> T. Haecker, *Vergil Vater des Abendlandes*: Leipzig, Hegner (1935), 82.

<sup>13</sup> *De Inv.* ii, 66. *Somnium Scip.* 16: *Iustitiam cole et pietatem, quae cum magna in parentibus et propinquis, tum in patria maxima est*. Cf. also *De Off.* i, 57.



*deos* was impossible without exact observance of certain rites and sacrifices. So it is for *pietas senatus populi que Romani* to show gratitude to the Martian legion outwardly. They must show *officium et diligens cultus*, as is owing to all objects of *pietas*—to quote from a second definition by Cicero.<sup>14</sup>

The *cultus* due the soldiers, both the fallen and the survivors, is *honos* provided by *honos*. Cicero states (29): *Aequum est . . . militum . . . honorem coniungi*: "It is but fair that a public recognition for our soldiers be added" (to that recommended for their generals).

What is *honos* (*honor*)? In English perhaps oftener than not the word signifies something received and possessed, rather than manifested and given. For the Roman—and this is as true for Cicero as for Plautus—the dual meaning of the word gives preponderance to agency: it nearly always stresses activity, action in favor of another. It is *honoring*. Its verbal nature is clearly recognized from the frequent phrase, practically belonging to Latin formula language, *honorem habere*. This does not mean to possess honor or to be honored, but to posit an act of recognition, to accord recognition; and even the phrase, *in honore esse*, to all appearances connoting a purely static condition, conveys the idea of action when the dative of the doer is added.<sup>15</sup> Again, as was shown above, *pietas* is expressed by *cultus*: this action-noun and the verb *colere*, it is pertinent to add, repeatedly occur in conjunction with *honos*.<sup>16</sup>

Cicero defines *honos* as *praemium virtutis iudicio studioque civium delatum ad aliquem*.<sup>17</sup> The predominantly active or effective force of the word is at once seen from the definition. That it is an *actio civium* is also important. That *honos* is usually vested with a public or political tenor, registering recognition by the *cives*, *populus*, *senatus*—by the *societas Romana*, collectively or vicariously—of well-exercised citizenship is not surprising when we have noted what *fides* and *pietas* bespeak for the feeling and outlook of the Romans toward their commonwealth.

<sup>14</sup> *De Inv.* II, 161. Cf. Haecker, *op. cit.*, 80 f.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. F. Klose, *Die Bedeutung von honos und honestus* (diss. Breslau): Ohlau, Eschenhagen (1933), 13–15; 22 f.; 53 f. He quotes (55; cf. also 85) Cicero, *Brutus* 127: Qui (epilogus C. Galbae) tanto in honore pueris nobis erat, ut eum etiam edisceremus.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Cicero, *De Inv.* II, 161 and 166; *Pro Arch.* 6 (Klose, 24).

<sup>17</sup> *Brutus* 281.

To continue: to the surviving soldiers *praemia* will be given. As for the fallen, *facile est bene agere cum eis . . .* (30). *Quorum de honore ulinam . . . plura in mentem venirent! Duo certe non praeteribo . . . : quorum alterum pertinet ad virorum fortissimorum gloriam sempiternam*, etc. (31).

Here we meet another Roman character-word, *gloria*. It has been said that a dual connotation, stressing agency, is much less evident in *gloria* than in *honor*; that the former is a permanent possession and that all it implies centers upon the subject and its personal claim or title to it.<sup>18</sup> But it seems that in an effort to establish a marked cleavage of meaning these differences have been overemphasized. *Gloria*, as frequently defined by Cicero and as has been pointed out before,<sup>19</sup> conveys the same emphasis of glorification as an expression of active esteem, as *honor* is expressive of an honoring. The following definitions, taken from both ends of Cicero's literary estate, illustrate this: *Gloria est frequens de aliquo fama cum laude*; and it is *laus recte factorum magnorumque in rem publicam fama meritorum, quae cum optimi cuiusque, tum etiam multitudinis testimonio comprobatur*.<sup>20</sup> The prevailing import of actual judgment and recognition (*laus . . . testimonio comprobatur*) by the state-society for a deserving member of that society should be evident.<sup>21</sup> But its bestowal by *all* the citizens (*optimi cuiusque, tum etiam multitudinis*) for great public services rendered (*magnorumque in rem publicam meritorum*), elevates it above *honor*. A third distinguishing mark is brought out by Cicero in the sentence (31) that introduced the concept under discussion: *gloria* is a permanent gift, lasting beyond death (*ad virorum . . . gloriam sempiternam*). In one of his many reviews of his consular year he

<sup>18</sup> Thus Klose, *op. cit.*, 15 f.; 25; 44 f.

<sup>19</sup> By U. Knoche, "Der römische Ruhmesgedanke," in *Philologus* XLIII (1934), 102-124.

<sup>20</sup> *De Inv.* II, 166 and *Phil.* I, 29. Other definitions by Cicero: *Tusc. Disp.* III, 3; *De Off.* II, 31; *Pro Marc.* 26.

<sup>21</sup> Knoche (*loc. cit.*, 103) makes these very interesting observations: Before the Christian era there is in Roman literature only one instance of *gloria deorum*; and there (Ovid, *Met.* I, 465) it can be resolved into an anthropomorphism. Again, up to the second century after Christ no Roman woman received *gloria*. The gods were not subject to judgment by the *societas Romana*; in the case of woman, such judgment was the prerogative of her husband.



asks: *Nesciebam vitae brevem esse cursum, gloriam sempiternam?*<sup>22</sup> Here we are at the source of Cicero's burning ambition. Here was his immortality, though only in part; for, as we shall see, he was too Roman to strive after nothing more than an exalted aloneness among Roman posterity and among men of aftertime.

To look back and briefly correlate the concepts thus far examined, adding a word on others incidentally mentioned: *Honos merita* is a public recognition for *merita*, public services performed. When extraordinary *merita* are accorded universal recognition with permanence assured, *gloria* results. *Merita* are, however, engendered by *virtus*, and recognition for it is the ultimate object of *honos* and *gloria*. *Honos* may come to the ordinary *vir bonus* and to the *vir magnus*; and if *honos* be given concrete expression, the *honores*—for example, the various magistracies—will be correspondingly great. But *gloria* is the portion of the *vir magnus* only.<sup>23</sup>

Seen from the utilitarian *do-ut-des* standpoint—and this aspect of Roman nature is ever present, but should not be stressed to the point of overlooking others—both *honos* and *gloria* are *praemia virtutis*, rewards, recompenses.<sup>24</sup> The interesting distinction has been recorded that when in the military sphere *praemia* and *honores* are mentioned together, the former designate material rewards to soldiers (e.g., bounties, land), the latter, ambition's prizes to officers and generals (e.g., promotion, triumph).<sup>25</sup> An earlier *Philippic*, the *Fifth*, illustrates this well (4; 35–54); but it is also found in the *Fourteenth*: special *honores* for the generals—Hirtius, Pansa, and the young Caesar—and renewed promises of *praemia* for the soldiers are asked. The granting of the latter—and this returns us to the panegyric—is dictated by *fides* (29: *Est autem fidei . . . nostrae*; 30: *quibus senatus fides praestabitur*) to the living. Cicero would have this same *fides* shown to the fallen soldiers too by paying out the *praemia* promised them to their surviving relatives (35). But he would also give them *honos*, a *honos* so great

<sup>22</sup> *Pro Sest.* 47; cf. *ibid.* 143; *In Cat.* iv, 21; *In Pis.* 63; *Ad Att.* xiv, 11, 1, etc.; also Knoche, *loc. cit.*, 105 f. and n. 19.

<sup>23</sup> This distinction is made by Knoche, *loc. cit.*, 105 f.

<sup>24</sup> Cicero, *Brut.* 281: *Cum honos sit praemium virtutis . . . Pro Mil.* 97: *Ex omnibus praemiis virtutis, amplissimum praemium est gloria.*

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Klose, *op. cit.*, 41; 93.

and extraordinary as to assure for them a third token of gratitude, the highest Rome could give and gave only to her great—*gloria*. And here the Republic, now really in its death-struggle, expresses its *pietas* for heroes who had died victims of their own *pietas* for the *patria* and sustains Cicero's appeal.

*Monumentum fieri quam amplissimum*, is the *honor* and *cultus pietatis* that Cicero asks for the slain legionaries (31). That he wishes this monument to be *quam amplissimum* tempts one to see in this another instance of Roman ethos revealed; for it can be pointed out that *amplus* is actually a space-word, meaning in the first place: great, large, wide, extensive, ample, spacious. It conveys the idea of size and bulk. Somewhat later (33) the monument is envisioned as *exstructa moles opere magnifico*. The dictionary will yield a size-and-bulk interpretation of these words too; though undoubtedly Cicero's colleagues in the Senate understood him as advocating "the erection of a great monument of magnificent workmanship." It is true, the orator does not expressly say that he wishes the monument to be beautiful and artistic in design and execution; and elsewhere in the *Philippics*, even in cases of proposals properly calling for plastic art, scarcely any aesthetic consideration is discoverable.<sup>26</sup> Nor is a search of the Greek funeral orations for an illustration of the national antithesis made wholly in vain: Cicero's *moles opere magnifico* may well be contrasted with Plato's *ταφή καλή τε καὶ μεγαλοπρεπής*.<sup>27</sup> But the truisim of the realistic and prosy natures of the Romans, as prosy and rustic as the names they bore, has been *sub iudice* often enough.<sup>28</sup> Here it suffices to have indicated that the Roman *ieiunitas bonarum artium*<sup>29</sup> is documented in a measure even in the last oration of Cicero.

<sup>26</sup> In v, 41 he asks for a *statua equestris inaurata* to honor M. Lepidus; in ix, 13 and 16, for a *statua pedestris aenea* in memory of Ser. Sulpicius.

<sup>27</sup> *Menex.* 234C. In Rome's heroic, prehistoric time bulk and size distinguish the tomb of the hero: that of Misenus is *ingenti mole sepulcrum* (Vergil, *Aen.* vi, 232), that of Dercennus, *ingens . . . bustum* (*ibid.* xi, 849 f.).

<sup>28</sup> Cf., for example, G. Showerman, "Cicero's Appreciation of Greek Art," in *Am. Jour. Phil.* xxv (1904), 306-314; A. Besançon, *Les adversaires de l'Hellenisme à Rome pendant la période républicaine*: Paris, Alcan (1910), 294-304; etc.

<sup>29</sup> The words are Cicero's: *De Or.* ii, 10.

It will be eminently wise senatorial policy to provide for the monument as a concrete expression of Rome's gratitude to the heroes of Forum Gallorum. Cicero states in §30: *Maxime . . . proprium senatus sapientis est, grata eorum virtutem memoria prosecui, qui pro patria vitam profuderunt.*

*sapientia*  
*prudentia*

Of course, this *sapientia* has little or nothing in common with the abstract σοφία of the Greeks. Most often, and that holds too for those portions in Cicero's philosophical works in which he does some Roman thinking of his own, *sapientia* is practically identical with *prudentia*, *providentia*, *providere*. Thus he states in the *Hortensius* (frg. 33M): *Id enim est sapientis, providere; ex quo sapientia est appellata prudentia.* Again, in *De Rep.* I, 45: *Sapientis est . . . prospicere.* Similarly, *De Off.* I, 153.

This idea of foreseeing the future and making corresponding provision certainly is the implication of *senatus sapientis est. . . virtutem memoria prosecui*. Roman *prudentia*, i.e. Roman *praevidere* and *providere*, was the very basis and prerequisite of Roman *auctoritas*. That by which Rome's destinies were directed more than by anything else, *senatus auctoritas*, presupposed *senatus prudentia*; and shaping the life of every Roman was *maiorum auctoritas*, derived from their *prudentia* and *sapientia*, as frequently exemplified by Cicero's pointing out momentous matters that the ancestors had foreseen and provided for.

Quite evidently for Cicero this *prudentia* or *sapientia* is not to be identified with any extraordinary gift of prognostication. It comes from well-marked experience (*usus*) and circumspection (*consilium*). In *De Inv.* II, 160 Cicero expatiates on *prudentia* as containing three elements: *memoria*, *intelligentia*, and *providentia*. The first of these is *per quam animus repetit illa quae fuerunt*; the second, *per quam ea perspicit quae sunt*; and the third, *per quam futurum aliquid videtur ante quam factum sit*. Hence *prudentia* encompasses the past, present, and future. This, to my mind—and the digression finds its excuse in Cicero's proposal for the future—is typical of the triple countenance which life in the Roman family and in the larger family of the state often reveals to our scrutiny. The Romans of Cicero's day still live, or pretend to live, *more maiorum*. They live again the past in the present, with their fore-

bears. But Roman living is also determined by the future, by future Romans. Forever conscious of being *maiorum posteri*, they never forget that they themselves, the living, are *posterorum maiores*. And this consciousness does not beget a mere attitude or sentiment, an esteem for the past, the *ἔπαινος* and *ἐπιδείξις τῶν προγόνων* of the Greeks, and the wistful wish to be remembered after death; but it is a consciousness of a sacred duty to be performed toward those who made Rome in the past, and toward those who will bear Rome's destiny and name in the future. This is, in largest measure, the Roman idea and instinct of immortality, Cicero's *praesentire, prospicere in futurum*.<sup>30</sup>

This communion of the living, the dead, and those yet in the womb of *Roma aeterna*, and the immortality it effects, are well brought out as Cicero continues in §33:

Actum igitur praeclare *vobiscum*, fortissimi dum vixistis, *nunc* vero etiam *sanctissimi* milites, quod vestra virtus neque oblivione *eorum qui nunc sunt* nec reticentia *posterorum* sepulta esse poterit.

That which will assure the departed heroes an abiding presence among their own now and in the future is their *virtus*. This—to *virtus* state a very patent truth—is involved and aspects of it appear in every discussion of *Romanitas*. Thus, much has been said about *virtus*, but the book—scarcely a doctoral dissertation—on what it is, remains to be written. The Romans of the republican times were scarcely aware of it as a comprehensive ethical concept. In this sense *virtus* is the philosopher's surrogate for *ἀρετή*. The *virtus* we are concerned with—mentioned nine times in the eulogy—is one of a number of *virtutes* and above all others the Roman national virtue: manliness, courage, bravery—*fortitudo*.<sup>31</sup> In the

<sup>30</sup> Compare Cicero's panegyric §32 with *Pro Rab. perd.* 29 f.; *Pro Arch.* 29; *Pro Sest.* 143; *Pro. Mil.* 97 f.; *Tusc. Disp.* I, 32 f. Conclusions very similar are reached by J. Vogt, "Ciceros Glaube an Rom," in *Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft* VI: Stuttgart, Kohlhammer (1935), 93-101; and J. Plumpe, *Wesen und Wirkung der Auctoritas Maiorum bei Cicero* (diss. Münster): Bochum-Langendreer, Pöppinghaus (1935), 69-74. Other investigations on ancestors at Rome: H. Rech, *Mos Maiorum, Wesen und Wirkung der Tradition in Rom* (diss. Marburg): Lengerich, Lengeriche Handelsdruckerei (1936), and H. Roloff, *Maiores bei Cicero* (diss. Leipzig): Göttingen, Universitäts-Buchdruckerei (1938).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Heinze, *Vom Geist des Römertums*, 279 (lecture notes reported by Burck):

passage quoted above from §33 Cicero himself interprets it as such: "Actum igitur praeclare vobiscum, *fortissimi*, . . . quod vestra *virtus*. . ."

*Virtus Romana* was a man's virtue; it marked him, whether he wore the *sagum* or the *toga*, with a soldier's mettle. I know of no better statement on its nature and the people it animated than that Heinze once made in a classical conference. The following translation, it is hoped, does justice to the original formulation: "What in Greece was class virtue of the nobility, at the time when *ἀρετή* was little evolved beyond the meaning of bravery—this was, and remained, a citizen's virtue at Rome, at least for the duration of the Republic."<sup>32</sup>

*nomen  
populi  
Romani*

Finally, in the last paragraph (35), Cicero states that but for the heroism of the legionaries at Forum Gallorum the *nomen populi Romani* would have been extinguished by the parricide of Antony. This *nomen populi Romani* is of very frequent concern to Cicero. A profounder significance attaches to the word than is suggested by "name," "illustrious name," "fame," "reputation," etc., of the Roman people. It seems that its provenience should be sought in *nomen gentis*. As is known, in Roman nomenclature *nomen* or *nomen gentis* [*n. generis, gentile, gentilicium*] was the equivalent of a person's middle name, indicating his origin by *gens*, or clan. Sometimes *nomen familiae* stands for the same, rather than for the *cognomen*. Besides being used alone for *gens* as well as *familia*, *nomen* can also have the more general meaning of race, stock, or people. An investigation, therefore, into Cicero's usage of the phrase *nomen populi Romani*—and none has been made to the writer's knowledge—should take into account every occurrence of the word in his writings.<sup>33</sup>

An incomplete inquiry suggests these preliminary observations: The expression *nomen populi Romani* apparently indicates the transfer of something proper to the clan and family to the highest

---

Diejenige moralische Eigenschaft, die die grösste Expansionsfähigkeit gezeigt hat, ist *virtus*, die Mannhaftigkeit, die *soldatische Bewährung* (latter italics mine).

<sup>32</sup> *Vom Geiste des Römertums*, 280. A paraphrase is given by H. Roloff in a recent review of the book just mentioned, in *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* CC1 (1939), 97 f.

<sup>33</sup> Related phrases found frequently: *nomen Romanum*, *n. rei publicae*, *n. imperii*.



form of society, the *res publica*. It indicates the injection of another personal, ethical note into the state-citizen relationship. The note lies on the surface in many passages: the *nomen populi Romani* is most sacred and dear, it is violated and contaminated, it is sold into bondage, etc. In the case under consideration Cicero states that the name would have been destroyed: *parricidio M. Antoni nomen populi Romani occidisset*. One seems justified in linking such a thought and the patriotic sentiment from which it springs, here and elsewhere in Cicero, with the following historical aspect of Roman nomenclature: When in republican times and even later a patrician was found guilty of high treason, his condemnation included a *damnatio memoriae*. For the future no member of his *gens* was permitted to bear his *praenomen*. In the words of Gellius, the *praenomina* of men so condemned were meant to be *defamata atque demortua cum ipsis*.<sup>34</sup>

We know of two celebrated cases of such procedure. The one, a stock example mentioned by Cicero in his first invective against Antony (32), concerns M. Manlius Capitolinus, executed as a revolutionary in 384. Under Augustus the same *praenomen* "Marcus" was proscribed for the Antonii when the senate decreed a *damnatio memoriae* for the *hostis patriae iudicatus*, Mark Antony. Later Caligula forced Cn. Pompeius Magnus to drop his *cognomen*.<sup>35</sup> But there is no record of a *nomen gentis* ever having been thus extirpated, which "would have meant the extinction of the *gens*."<sup>36</sup> There was no more anxious concern of the Romans than to prevent such extinction. The precautions taken to assure the continuance of the *nomen gentis* and the *nomen familiae*—adoption, for example, in all its complicated forms—are ever in evidence.<sup>37</sup> This attitude is reproduced in the Roman's conduct toward the state, whose welfare and continued existence he idealizes and to a

<sup>34</sup> *Noctes Atticae* ix, 12, 11.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Dio Cassius LX, 5, 8 f.; Suetonius, *Calig.* 35. For the case of M. Manlius cf. also Livy, vi, 20, 14; Quintilian III, 7, 20; Festus, ed. Lindsay p. 112; 135; Dio Cassius vii, frg. 26, 1; for that of Antony, Plutarch, *Cic.* 49; Dio Cassius, LI, 19, 3. The subject is discussed and exemplified at length by B. Doer, *Die Römische Namengebung*: Stuttgart, Kohlhammer (1937), 32-37. <sup>36</sup> Doer, *op. cit.*, 33.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien*: Stuttgart, Metzler (1920), 424-428; Doer, *op. cit.*, 81 and *passim*.

degree humanizes as the honor and perpetuity of the *nomen populi Romani*.

Instructive, too, is this point of view: The Roman dominion of Cicero's day was far greater in extent than that of the Italian Empire to-day. Yet, it was never called *Italia* or *Italia Magna* or *Imperium Italicum*, but *Roma* it remained. A very isolated Rome it had been from its arduous first days on the Palatine; aloof it chose to stand even after its treaty with the Latin cities; and as it marched from the unification of Italy to the conquest and absorption of the world, it never sacrificed or shared one whit of its own individuality. It did not tolerate the shadow of an *altera Roma*, and the charge, for example, of planning to establish one at Capua contributed to the doom of the agrarian bill in the year 63. Significantly enough Cicero calls *hanc Romam*, not Italy, *communem patriam omnium nostrum*.<sup>38</sup> For those who lived outside the *pomerium* of Rome—the inhabitants of the *municipia*, the Latin colonists, the Italian allies, the provincials—the *nomen populi Romani* was the very essence of Rome,<sup>39</sup> pervading the lives of them all; and thus, in the happy phrasing of Montesquieu, though not of the same country, they were all Romans: *Sans être compatriotes, ils étaient tous Romains*.<sup>40</sup> And again, just as the Roman *gens* sought to perpetuate itself and the *ius imaginum*, and the *nomen gentis* gave expression to this desire, so also the *nomen populi Romani* brought out for both citizen and subject the wish for *Roma sempiterna*, the *diuturnitas imperii*, forever in the mind and mouth of Cicero.

In the foregoing paragraphs I have attempted to recognize and sketch the chief elements of *Romanitas* pulsating through a speech of scarcely three chapters within a larger Ciceronian speech. If we classicists are told to-day that an ague is upon us which no *Iliad* iv will cure, if it is dinned into our ears that we must die

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Cicero, *Leg. Agr.* II, 86–89; and J. Vogt, *op. cit.*, 94.

<sup>39</sup> This is similarly expressed by J. Vogt, *ibid.* More recently H. Fuchs, in *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt*: Berlin, de Gruyter (1938), I [I quote from the review by E. Hohl in *Phil. Wochenschrift* LX (1940), 37], has described Rome as the *Inbegriff* (essence), *sichtbare Verkörperung* (visible embodiment), und *Sinnbild* (symbol) of the entire empire.

<sup>40</sup> *Grandeur et Décadence des Romains*<sup>3</sup>: Paris, Librairie Hachette (1906), 76.



unless we prove the classics sufficiently responsive to social and economic objectives, is it not really eminently within our heritage of humanistic value to meet this challenge? Individual (*individuus*), community (*communitas*), society (*societas*), citizenship (*civitas*)—does not the state exist and thrive by these very qualities—abstractions we call them—even as it does by all the concrete things that you may ask your students of Latin to identify and reconstruct from Roman living? Of course the understanding and assimilation of these concepts and values by the instructor and the imparting of them to the pupil are two very different things. But a *communicatio utilitatum* is involved that is well worth the hard work it takes.

## Notes

[All contributions in the form of notes for this department should be sent directly to Roy C. Flickinger, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.]

### HIC AQUATIO: CICERO, DE OFFICIIS III, 14, 59

To the eager questions of Canius, the Roman "sucker" (after all, this is a fish story), about the presence of so many fishermen and fishing-craft in front of the villa of the slick "realtor" Pythius, the latter replied: *Quid mirum? hoc loco est Syracusis quidquid est piscium, hic aquatio, hac villa isti carere non possunt*. What did he mean by the last two statements? There seems to be much variety of opinion on the point.

The most ancient explanation is that offered by St. Ambrose in his *De Officiis Clericorum Libri Tres* III, 11, 71, where Cicero's story is told over again: *Responsum quaerenti aquationem illic esse, dulcis aquae gratia innumerabiles eo pisces convenire*.<sup>1</sup> The latter part of the sentence is obviously an explanation of the word *aquationem* as St. Ambrose understood it. The water is fresh, untold numbers of fish come there on that account, and wherever the fish are, there are the fishermen gathered together; thus *aquatio* means virtually a fishing-ground. To this meaning Shuckburgh returned in his revision of Holden's *De Officiis* with its incomparable commentary.<sup>2</sup> Holden had left this note standing: *aquatio*] sc. *piscium*, "a place for the fish to get fresh water from,"—St. Ambrose's explanation. Shuckburgh added: [or simply 'water' in the sense in which fishermen use the word; *aquatio* for *aquae* as *notio* for *notae*, §111]. Shuckburgh, that is, interpreted *aquatio* in the Ciceronian passage

<sup>1</sup> Apud *Bibliotheca Patrum Ecclesiasticorum Selecta*: Leipzig, Tauchnitz (1839), VIII, Pars 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. E. S. Shuckburgh and H. A. Holden, *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Officiis Libri Tres*: Cambridge, at the University Press (1899).

as I have interpreted it in St. Ambrose, "water" in the technical sense of "fishing-place," though he does not reach that conclusion through St. Ambrose's explanation. The technical sense "water" I came across last in Dorothy Sayers' *Suspicious Characters* (highly recommended to classicists for serious reading): "We were netting the pool just below the fall." "Oh, were you? That's the Earl of Galloway's water." Incidentally I think Shuckburgh's note should be revised to read: *aquatio* for *aqua*, as *notiones* for *notae*. To this category of explanations belong also Thos. Cockman's (1699) translation in *Everyman's Library*: "All the fish that supply the city must be taken here; this is their common water," and the rendering by Cyrus R. Edmonds in the *Bohn Library*: "Whatever fish there are at Syracuse, are taken at this place; here is their watering-place."

But some of the editors and translators have had far other ideas. One Barrett<sup>3</sup> translates: *D'ailleurs c'est chez moi que les pêcheurs viennent prendre de l'eau*. So also Roger L'Estrange:<sup>4</sup> "For there is not any Fish [says he] in *Syracuse* which is not to be had in this place. They take in their Water here, and the Town cannot be without this convenience." The "they" is surely the fishermen in L'Estrange's estimation. Thus up till now we have had those who refer *aquatio* to the fish and those who regard it as applying to the fishermen.

But we have not exhausted the possibilities by any means. Carl Beier<sup>5</sup> in his edition, after quoting St. Ambrose, adds: *Immo ipsi Syracusani illinc aquas petere dicuntur*. Thus we pass on to the idea that *aquatio* represents a municipal water-works; the word is now referred to the inhabitants of Syracuse, not to the fish, nor to the fishermen. So E. P. Crowell<sup>6</sup> in his commentary: "*aquatio*, the

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Barrett, *Les Offices de Cicéron, traduction nouvelle*<sup>4</sup>: Paris, Barbou Frères, Year IV of the Republic. Apparently this work first appeared in 1759 but without the translator's name.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Roger L'Estrange, *Tully's Offices in Three Books*<sup>2</sup>: London, printed for Henry Brome (1681).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Carl Beier, *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Officiis Libri Tres*: Leipzig, Steinacker and Wagner (2 vols., 1820).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. E. P. Crowell, *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Officiis Libri Tres*<sup>2</sup>: Philadelphia, Eldredge and Bro. (1882).

place from which must be obtained all the water for the city," and Austin Stickney<sup>7</sup> likewise in the note in his edition. R. Kuehner<sup>8</sup> provided this version: *Von hier bekommt Syrakus seine Fische, von hier sein Wasser.*

Thus far definiteness; there remain to be cited those who adroitly refuse to pin themselves down as to the destination and use of the water. Thus Professor Walter Miller in the Loeb Library translation: "This is where all the fish in Syracuse are; here is where the fresh water comes from,"—but whether for fish, fishermen, or citizens, deponent sayeth not. Conrad Heusinger<sup>9</sup> had appended to *aquatio* the noncommittal note: *Unde dulcis aqua petenda est.* Anthon<sup>10</sup> similarly explained *aquatio* as "a spot to get good water from." In Bonnell's<sup>11</sup> revision of Degen this comment appears: *aquatio*] *eigentlich und sonst immer "das Wasserholen," nur an diese Stelle "der Ort wo das Wasser geholt wird,"* by whom, it is not suggested.

With regard to the matter submitted above I can only remark that to me it is inconceivable that *isti* means anything but the fishermen. Pythius means "your friends out there," as we might colloquially put it. It takes more courage (and Latin) than I have to drag the townsmen in. Canius is looking at the spectacle before him and asking for an explanation of the fishing fleet he is viewing; Pythius would obviously want to connect the fishermen with the property to be sold. Further, that *aquatio* might mean a place from which fishermen get their supply of fresh water, I do not deny; but why would that be an inducement for Canius to buy? The pittance

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Austin Stickney, *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Officiis ad Marcum Filium Libri Tres*: New York, Harper and Bros. (1885).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Raphael Kuehner, *Cicero's drei Buecher von den Pflichten uebersetzt und erklart*: Stuttgart, Hoffman'sche Verlags-Buchhandlung (1873).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Conrad Heusinger, *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Officiis Libri Tres*: Oxford, Clarendon Press (1821).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Chas. Anthon., *M. T. Ciceronis de Officiis Libri Tres*: New York, Harper and Bros. (1869). This is described as the First American Edition, corrected and enlarged, of Holden's original (first) edition in England.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Ed. Bonnell, and Joh. Fried. Degen, *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Officiis Libri Tres*: Berlin, Verlag von Veit und Comp. (1848).

that could be extracted from the fishermen for water seems to be too small a consideration to be taken into account in attempting an explanation of the passage. As for the city water-works, I can only profess my amazement at the solemn way in which the prospectus of its possibilities is offered by the commentators to the classical public right in the middle of an excellent fish yarn. Is it reasonable that Pythius should start with fish and end with fishermen, and midway effect a diversion to water-works?

Here is the situation. Canius has seen (and smelled; cf. end of §58 in the Ciceronian passage) fish; Pythius knows what has excited Canius, and it may be assumed that he is a good enough salesman to follow up his own prepared trap (see §58) and to expedite Canius' falling into it. Canius talks fish; Pythius replies fish. This is what he says: "Why the excitement? All the fish taken at Syracuse are found in this spot. Here is a 'water.' Yonder fishermen can't dispense with this estate." The point in the last remark is that the "water" goes with the estate; the estate-owner also controls the fishing rights, owns the "water." The fishermen can't dispense with the estate because, according to Pythius, they must fish there or nowhere. If Canius' cupidity is excited, and not merely his characteristic Roman fish-appetite, he sees the big chance, not in peddling water to the fishermen, but in selling them the privilege of being on his "water" at all, in short in maintaining a perpetual tax on their livelihood.

I am entirely convinced, then, that Shuckburgh's idea that *aquatio* is *aqua* in a technical fisherman's usage is right, lending itself as it does perfectly to the dramatic aspects of the whole situation at this point in the story, and agreeing substantially with the oldest available commentary on the passage, that of St. Ambrose, quoted or referred to, curiously enough, by most of the commentators, but only to be ignored in their subsequent explanations. The ways of classical commentators are past finding out.

WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
BERKELEY



## ABSIT OMEN

Some years ago a new private hospital was in process of organization in Canada under very fashionable auspices. Through the College of Heralds in London permission was secured to use the coat-of-arms of a noble English family. Orders were placed for furnishings without inquiring about the family motto. In due time table-linen and chinaware arrived bearing the legend *ad mortem*.

NORMAN W. DEWITT

VICTORIA COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

A NOTE ON HONEY-DUMPLINGS AND  
SUGAR-COATED PILLS

In the opening chapter of the *Satyricon* of Petronius Encolpius complains about the impractical character of the speeches delivered in the rhetorical schools. He describes these speeches as follows (I, 3): *mellitōs verborum globulos et omnia dicta factaque quasi papavere et sesamo sparsa*,<sup>1</sup> "honey-dumpling speeches—everything that is said and done sprinkled, as it were, with poppy seed and sesame." *Globi* and *globuli* were "dumplings," made of a mixture of cheese and leavened spelt-dough and cooked in a copper vessel containing hot oil. After they were cooked they were smeared with honey and sprinkled with poppy seed (cf. Cato, *De Agri Cult.* 79, and Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* v, 107). Hence, to pastry-cooks, *melliti globuli* were "honey-dumplings." That Petronius had in mind the art of the pastry-cook is shown by the fact that the verbal "honey-dumplings" are sprinkled with poppy seeds and sesame (cf. also Petronius, *Satyr.* xxxi, 10: *glires melle ac papavere sparsos*).

J. G. W. M. De Vreese,<sup>2</sup> in his search for astrological influences in Petronius, discovers a persistent use of terms of the culinary art in association with the art of the rhetor (cf. I, 3: *mellitōs verborum globulos*; II, 1: *qui inter haec nutriuntur*; II, 1: *qui in culina habitant*; and III, 3: *cum cenas . . . capiunt*, etc.) and the association

<sup>1</sup> The text is that of Franciscus Buecheler, *Petronii Saturae*, revised by Heraeus: Berlin, Weidmann (1922).

<sup>2</sup> *Petron 39 und die Astrologie*: Amsterdam, H. J. Paris (1927), 208–216.

of both with astrology (cf. XXXIX, 12: *in piscibus (nati sunt) obsonatores et rhetores*), which explains rather neatly the collocation of the two arts in the early chapters of the *Satyricon*.

*Globuli* were also used of a physician's "pills" (cf. Scribonius Largus, *Compositiones* XIII, LIX, etc.); and so *melliti globuli*, in a different context, could mean "honey-pills," "sugar-coated pills." That physicians in ancient times attempted to lessen the bitterness of their doses is evidenced by the repeated use of honey in the medical preparations collected by Scribonius (*op. cit.*, VIII, IX, etc.) and by the familiar passage in Lucretius (I, 936-50), where the poet says that just as physicians smear honey over the rims of cups containing bitter concoctions intended for children, so he will sweeten his philosophy with the charms of poetry; cf. also Seneca Rhetor, *Suasoriae* 7: *Decipere vos cogar, veluti salutare pueris daturus potionem absinthiaci poculi*.

ELI E. BURRISS

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE  
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

#### A NOTE ON TIBULLUS I, 1, 1-4

Divitias alius fulvo sibi congerat auro  
et teneat culti iugera multa soli,  
quem labor adsiduus vicino terreat hoste,  
Marta cui somnos classica pulsa fugent.

The first elegy of Tibullus illustrates *par excellence* "the gentle ebb and flow of the poetic thought so characteristic of Tibullus" (Harrington), and with its simplicity of diction and naturalness of structure the opening lines, quoted above, are well in accord. The interpretation, however, that well-known editors have assigned to *quem . . . terreat* (vs. 3) and *cui . . . fugent* (vs. 4) appears to me to mar the logic of the lines and to blur their lucidity. Incidentally the passage possesses no textual problem; even the unusual expression *classica pulsa* involves no suspicion as to the reading. Further, the parallel passages<sup>1</sup> commonly cited by editors throw no light on its syntax.

<sup>1</sup> Viz. Caes. B. G. VII, 41, and Ovid, *Pont.* IV, 9, 82. Both of these are quoted by Postgate (in his *Selections*, n. *ad loc.*) and by Pichard (in his: *Tibullus et les Auteurs du*

Smith<sup>2</sup> declared simply that *terreat* and *fugent* are consecutive subjunctives. Ramsay<sup>3</sup> explained that *terreat* is subjunctive because no individual is pointed at in *alius* (vs. 1): *quem* thus has a consecutive force "one of such a kind as." Petrie<sup>4</sup> laconically remarked: "*quem terreat*: consecutive, one of such a kind as to be scared." In their volume of selections, the Instructors in Latin of Williams College<sup>5</sup> take *terreat* as a subjunctive of characteristic or result, for they refer to the pertinent sections in three standard Latin Grammars.<sup>6</sup> The Canadian editors of another well-known book of verse selections<sup>7</sup> explain that *congerat* (vs. 1) is jussive, as well as *teneat* (vs. 2), and *traducat* (vs. 5), but are silent about *terreat* and *fugent*: it seems fair to infer that they did not similarly construe them. Harrington<sup>8</sup> thought that *terreat* is best regarded as a subjunctive of characteristic, like *fugent* in the next line: his phrasing suggests that he is aware of some other explanation.

Another editor<sup>9</sup> has a note on the matter which appears to be somewhat confused and lengthy but is nevertheless helpful. He asserted that these subjunctives express "desire" and refers to *NLP*,<sup>10</sup> 217A, adding that they correspond to *congerat*, and offered two versions, of which the better, to my mind, is "Let him be rich but let him live a life of unrest," though I should prefer "and" in-

*Corpus Tibullianum* par Louis Pichard, Paris: Librairie ancienne Honoré Champion (1924). Ramsay quotes the former passage, and Smith the latter, in their volumes for which see nn. 2 and 3 infra.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. K. F. Smith, *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus*: New York, American Book Company (1913), n. ad loc.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. G. G. Ramsay, *Selections from Tibullus and Propertius*: New York, Oxford University Press (1917), n. ad loc.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. A. Petrie, *A Latin Reader*: New York Oxford University Press (1918), n. ad loc.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. The Instructors in Latin, Williams College, *A Selection of Latin Verse*: New Haven, Yale University Press (1915), n. ad loc.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. A. (= Allen and Greenough), §535; B. (= Bennett), §283.1; L. (= Lane), §1818.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. K. P. R. Neville, R. O. Jolliffe, E. A. Dale, and D. Breslove, *A Book of Latin Poetry*: Toronto, Macmillan Co. (1931), n. ad loc.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. K. P. Harrington, *The Roman Elegiac Poets*: New York, American Book Company (1914), n. ad loc.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. J. P. Postgate, *Selections from Tibullus and Others*: New York, Macmillan Co. (1903), n. ad loc.

<sup>10</sup> *NLP* = J. P. Postgate, *The New Latin Primer*, New York, Cassell and Company (1919), §217A.

stead of "but." Some parts of his note I omit, but he finally referred, for similar subjunctives, to 3, 32 (= Tib. I, 5, 32) and to 8, 6 (= Tib. II, 2, 6). In his note on the latter passage, Postgate remarked that *decorent* has an imperative sense.

My own thought is that *quem* (vs. 3) and *cui* (vs. 4) are simply instances of the coördinating use of the relative,<sup>11</sup> in which, of course, the relative does not affect the mood of the verb. In the present passage, the subjunctives *terreat* and *fugent* are, it seems to me, jussive, or hortatory as some would prefer to phrase it. The advantages of this interpretation are obvious. The use of the relative avoids the tiresome repetition of *et* (already employed in vs. 2). Further, the paratactic structure suits the simple manner of the poet. Finally, this explanation appears to me to be more logical than those usually advanced: there is no purpose served in linking a clause of characteristic to the *alius* (vs. 1), nor yet do the ideas of vss. 3-4 flow, by way of a natural consequence or result, from the thought of vss. 1 f. Tibullus says in effect: Let anyone else energize for pelf and let him possess his land-emoluments with the toil and hazards they entail. His opening lines, then, I would render thus:

With ruddy gold, another riches heap,  
And acres many hold of soil well-sown;  
Him constant toil nigh foemen frightened keep,  
His slumber banish Mars's bugles blown.

S. JOHNSON

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA  
WINNIPEG, CANADA

<sup>11</sup> Cf. G. G. Bradley, *Aids to Writing Latin Prose*: New York, Longmans, Green and Co. (1902), §109,2; also M. B. Ogle, *English and Latin—A Manual of Prose Composition*: New York, The Century Company (1926), 14.

## Book Reviews

---

[Review copies of classical books should be sent to the Editorial Office of the JOURNAL at Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. Such works will always be listed in the department of Recent Books, and those which seem most important to the readers of the JOURNAL will also be reviewed in this department. The editor-in-chief reserves the right of appointing reviewers.]

ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT, *The Roman Use of Anecdotes*: New York, Longmans, Green and Co. (1940). Pp. ix+189. \$2.50.

*The Roman Use of Anecdotes* is the fourth of Professor Haight's brilliant books of studies in Roman fiction. The previous volumes are *Apuleius and His Influence*, *Romance in the Latin Elegiac Poets*, and *Essays on Ancient Fiction*. In the Preface of this latest volume she well says:

The *Roman Use of Anecdotes*, gentle reader, is not a trivial subject, however slight it may seem. The Romans saw such aesthetic and moral possibilities in the small story that the composition of it was a serious part of their education. They used the anecdote not only to enliven their literature but to convey great truths. So my book is a study of a literary form which is more important than the gem, the statuette, or the miniature in art. In its small compass you may see the speaking likenesses of many persons of many times, their manners and their morals.

The seven authors dealt with are Cicero, Livy, Horace, Phaedrus, Martial, Persius, and Juvenal. It is unnecessary to say more to prove that in collecting the material Professor Haight had to do a tremendous amount of research. Of course she had by herself often read all the works of these authors and selections from them many times with her classes. Nevertheless, all the reading had to be done again and with a very critical mind, in order to select just the quotations most pertinent to her use. Further, she has integrated her material in perfect order.

The first chapter of the volume is a scholarly essay resulting from a study of the rhetorical writings of the *Auctor ad Herennium*,



of Cicero, Seneca the Elder, Quintilian. The technical terms are all defined and discussed in so clear a style that even the general reader will find the chapter enlightening and interesting.

Then follow seven chapters dealing with the authors named above. In each of these the scores of apt quotations, long or short, are given in delightful sequence, with scholarly comments. The teacher, either in school or college, could not fail to derive much help for interpreting the authors' works, while reading any one of them, from Cicero to Juvenal. A somewhat similar statement applies to others, not teachers, who read these authors simply for personal pleasure and profit. Already the reviewer knows that the book has been found to be deeply interesting by one "gentle reader," who was never a teacher. At the end of each chapter is given a résumé of all that has been brought out in the chapter.

Of course one cannot read Juvenal, for instance, without finding much information about the Roman system of education. In connection with these passages, the instructor probably always has much from other sources to add on the subject. In this volume he will certainly find a great deal more that will be of deep interest to his students.

It is the reviewer's hope that one author in particular will be rescued from oblivion by this book. The majority of students who take Latin throughout their college days read a good many of the satires of Horace and of Juvenal. At the same time they hear something about Lucilius and probably read some of the fragments of his works, but to most students even after graduation Persius is not even a name. It is hardly necessary to say that the satires of Persius are not easy. Still, he was an estimable young man and he wrote brilliantly. With her keen scholarship and critical judgment, Professor Haight has given us a clear understanding of the importance of the poems of Persius, and this should influence the instructor to read at least a few of them with his classes. Even now, of course, Persius is read in some of our universities, though not as widely as he deserves.

Finally comes a brief chapter in retrospect, ending: "So the anecdote, though a miniature in dimensions, came to have its recognized and fitting place in literary art in as widely different

fields as the philosophical dialogue, the moral epistle, the oration, history, satire, fable, and epigram."

The reviewer's hope and firm belief is that Professor Haight is now writing another book.

M. N. WETMORE

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

*The Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation*: Editors, T. F. HIGHAM and C. M. BOWRA, New York, Oxford University Press (1938), Pp. cxii+781. \$3.00.

*The Oxford Book of Greek Verse* appeared in 1930. And in 1938 the Oxford University Press published this volume of English translations, edited by T. F. Higham and C. M. Bowra, to accompany the Greek text. Wherever possible, existing translations were used, but where no translations, or none that were suitable, existed, the editors, or their friends, have supplied their own.

A lengthy Introduction, of over one hundred pages, precedes the translations. In Part I (pp. vii-xxxii) of this Introduction, Mr. Bowra discusses "The Character and Development of Greek Poetry." This is a clear and helpful account for the interested reader, who has read little or no Greek in the original. The specialist may question the finality of certain pronouncements, in large measure true, but which might well be qualified, such as: "In the forms of its composition, in its language, in its choice of subjects, in its limitations and conventions, it followed lines which other literatures have not followed" (p. ix).

To the reasons given for the choice of verse by the Greeks for didactic compositions (p. xxx), this might well be added, namely, that perfected artistic prose was a comparatively late development.

Finally, in connection with Homeric poetry, it is of interest to note Mr. Bowra's verdict (p. xii) that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were composed probably in the eighth century and that a great creative genius built two single and harmonious works of art.

Part II (pp. xxxiii-cviii) of the Introduction consists of a series of brief chapters by Mr. Higham devoted to a discussion of the

following topics: "The Nature of Translation," "Problems of Meaning," "Problems of Form," "Translation in Practice," "The Two Main Sects of Translators" (the "Hellenizers" and the "Modernists"), "The Language of Greek Poetry," "Compound-Words in Greek and English," "The Greek Hexameter in English Verse," "Greek Choral Lyric in English Verse," "Translations into Prose and Prose-Poetry," and "Conclusions."

It will be seen that Mr. Higham has given consideration to all the aspects of the difficult and much-vexed question of Greek poetry in translation. And, in my opinion, the manner and method of presentation are deserving of praise, and the *pros* and *cons* are judiciously marshalled.

And now let us look at the translations themselves. On the whole, the work of the editors has been well performed. They were asked to do the impossible, as they themselves knew and as they thus admit: "The task of making this book was accepted with misgiving. Everyone knows that translators are traitors, and that they show the wrong side of the tapestry." In the Preface (p. xxxiii) they quote Robert Bridges' witty and priceless question (previously unknown to the reviewer and he is grateful for its citation): "If you really thought the original was like that, what can you have seen in it to make you think it was worth translating?"

In the volume there are 706 selections from some 135 authors. In the Index of Translators we find 125 names, in date from Thomas Stanley (1651) to the present day. The two editors, inviting praise or censure, have included many versions of their own.

The fifty-six selections from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are given in the versions of twenty-two translators and these are in verse and prose of every metre and style. Fortunately, of the prose versions of the *Odyssey*, only four are taken from the translation (in general, unsuccessful and frequently pedestrian) of T. E. Shaw (Lawrence).

Sir William Marris contributes a number of good translations throughout the volume, but Professor Paul Shorey's delightful rendering of (No. 104) "Archilochus' Shield" would have been a better choice. Furthermore, how could Mr. Higham reject J. A. Symonds' almost perfect version of Simonides' exquisite "Danaë" (No. 206)

and substitute his own good, but inferior, attempt? In my opinion the editors should have borrowed far more than they have from Symonds.

The Greek scholar, familiar with the original verse, will always deplore the inadequacy of any translation of a favorite passage. But this volume was not compiled for him, but for a new generation of readers, who enjoy great poetry and yet, alas, are ignorant of the Greek language. And these readers will derive profit and pleasure from this volume.

LARUE VAN HOOK

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *The Frame of the Ancient Greek Maps*; "American Geographical Society Research Series," No. 20: New York (1937). Pp. ix+137.

The value of this book has no relation to its volume. It is a work of serious importance, a little masterpiece of learning and acumen. Professor Heidel, who has put all students of ancient thought already in his debt, remarks that this new contribution is the fruit of twenty years' reflection; and one might have surmised as much. It is perhaps a pity that he had not greater scope in which to develop his arguments, but something is gained from the very conciseness with which they are presented—conciseness and, let it be added, precision and critical judgment. The reader will not find in Professor Heidel the least confusion between the known fact and the attractive hypothesis. His learning dispels clouds and does not accumulate them. The result is that in the region of this study, where the romantic and the exaggerated have too widely expatiated, we get a clear and convincing picture of what we really know.

The book naturally falls into two main parts, the first an account of what the author calls the "frame" in which the earth (conceived as a disk) was set by the early geographers, the second a discussion of the later conception of the earth as a sphere. The first part is a reconstruction from the scanty evidence for the principles, chiefly geometrical, on which the ancients designed their maps—principles which Mr. Heidel shows to have had a striking vitality. It was, however, this very vitality which (paradoxically) tended to

stereotype the maps, so that Alexander appears to have started on his eastern conquests with little more to guide him than the sort of diagram of the earth which made Herodotus laugh a century before. In the course of this discussion the author offers many suggestions and interpretations, none of which can be neglected as mistaken or improbable, though he himself would be the first to admit that the fragmentary and disconnected nature of the evidence makes it difficult to be sure what in many cases it really means. Yet one may well believe that his reconstruction will stand not merely as the best that hitherto has been made, but as the best that with the data we possess can at present be made.

The second portion of the book, dealing with the sphericity of the earth, raises the question of who first discovered this. The answer of Professor Heidel is that we do not know. But he thinks that the discovery was probably made not long before the composition of the *Phaedo*, which knows and in a manner accepts it. The theory suggested in the dialogue undoubtedly looks like a combination of Ionian geography with the notion of an ideally spherical earth—a notion which would most readily suggest itself to men who delighted in a mathematical symmetry; that is, to Pythagoreans. What more natural and delightful than that at the center of the spherical *cosmos* should be the concentric ball of the earth? And we happen to know that the construction of a sphere from a dodecagon of flexible material interested Pythagoreans, and is alluded to in the *Phaedo* itself. But that certain followers of Pythagoras may have held such a view—which of course cannot be harmonized with any hypothesis of a “central fire”—proves nothing about Pythagoras. Here I find myself in agreement with Heidel, and nothing in his book is more masterly than his destructive criticism of the claims made for Pythagoras, for Parmenides, and others, to have originated the doctrine that the earth was a globe.

Professor Heidel is so accurate that errors are not to be detected. The reviewer can find nothing at which to cavil, unless it be the following note:

Avienus, 250, gives the name Taurus to the mountains beginning at the Cimmerian Bosphorus. This is doubtless significant and suggests for this portion of his account a source dating at the earliest from the end of the fourth



century, because it was not until after Alexander's eastern campaign that the series of mountain chains crossing Asia from west to east came to be called Taurus instead of Caucasus, as in earlier times. (p. 113.)

But the Cimmerian Bosphorus was where the Tauri lived, and surely that will account for their mountains being called Taurus. But this is a mere note to a note, and in the end I can but repeat what I said in the beginning, that the book I have ventured to review is the work of a master.

J. A. K. THOMSON

KINGS COLLEGE  
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

HENRY HARMON CHAMBERLIN, *Last Flowers, A Translation of Moschus and Bion*: Cambridge, Harvard University Press (1937). Pp. xv+81.

A little more than four years ago Henry Harmon Chamberlin gave the world his metrical translations of Theocritus in a volume that delighted all lovers of Theocritus and all lovers of poetry. Now under the title of *Last Flowers* he presents his translations of Moschus, Bion, and Hermesianax. It is a slender book of eighty-one pages, twenty-three of which are set aside for introductory matter. These poems are not so fine as those of Theocritus, and yet they are fine enough to have exercised a considerable influence on the literature of western Europe. Mr. Chamberlin calls our attention to the fact that they have left their mark on Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Shelley, Wordsworth, Matthew Arnold, Landor, and Tennyson in English; on Dante, Poliziano, Tasso, and Carducci in Italian; on Clément Marot and André Chénier in French. In other words, they have been loved and imitated by a long line of distinguished poets, and they are still worthy to be loved in Mr. Chamberlin's translation by those of us who care for poetry. One naturally turns for purposes of comparison to the prose versions of Andrew Lang, and while we must admit that Lang's versions have charm and are not the "dead dust of prose," as our most recent translator would have us believe, we also have to admit that Lang does not succeed in bringing us into the atmosphere of the Greek world so well as Mr. Chamberlin.

It is perhaps ungrateful to complain that this successful book is not quite so good as the earlier *Theocritus*, and that our translator, who usually is so sensitive, has been careless in half a dozen lines.

It is worth noting that Mr. Chamberlin has written two pages of his own, completing Bion's *Couch of Deidameia*. In this he seems to have a gift comparable to that of William Morris in his *Earthly Paradise*.

CHARLES N. SMILEY

CARLETON COLLEGE  
NORTHFIELD, MINNESOTA

ALBIN LESKY, *Die Griechische Tragoedie*: Alfred Kröner, Leipzig.  
Pp. viii+258. RM. 2.65.

This small book, published in the series "Kröners Taschenausgabe," professes to make accessible to the lay-reader the history of Greek tragedy within as small compass as possible. Besides being a history in the commonly accepted sense of the term, it attempts—and attempts with a good deal of success—to analyze most of the plays of the three great tragic poets from the points of view of content and method of treatment. One defect, a defect that is natural to a book of its dimensions, is that it does not give much of the text of the tragedy in the treatment of each play. The reader soon becomes conscious that it is a book which must presuppose a previous reading of the play if the analysis and criticism are to be understood. It would seem to be too pretentious for a *Taschenausgabe*.

Looked at as a scholarly treatment of the subject, the book is astounding in the amount of material it presents. The history of the development of tragedy is given in a detailed manner that omits the mention of no modern view. The place of each tragic poet in the new period of enlightenment, and his attitude to the changing currents of thought are treated in satisfying fashion. When he turns to the field of bibliography the author packs into a few pages almost all that has been done up to the present day.

All in all, the book is a valuable manual for the student.

THOMAS S. DUNCAN

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

## Hints for Teachers

---

[Edited by Grace L. Beede, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, S. D. The aims of this department are threefold: to assist the inexperienced teacher of Latin, to help the experienced teacher keep in touch with matters of interest to the professional world, and to serve as a receiving center and distributing point for questions and contributions on teaching problems. Questions will be answered by mail or in the pages of this department. Contributions in the form of short paragraphs dealing with projects, tests, interest devices, methods, and material are requested. Anything intended for publication should be typed on stationery of regular size. All correspondence should be addressed to the editor of this department.]

### Roman Banquets—*Mirabile Visu*

Miss Grace Elmore has the reputation of supervising the best of Roman banquets every four years. She generously shares her ideas and the details of her plans with us. Read, and be inspired. Then write us about your banquets.

No project is worth-while, of course, unless the ends toward which the action is directed are worthy of the time and effort spent. Since a Roman banquet requires more time, thought, planning, and expense than most other projects assigned, it must contribute largely to the ultimate objectives of the study of Latin to justify its use.

We put on a Roman banquet every fourth year—no oftener than that, through fear of losing the keen interest of the pupils and the hearty coöperation of the townspeople, and as often as that because it does make a valuable contribution to at least some of the ends we are striving to attain in giving Latin to our high-school pupils.

Quoting Miss Frances E. Sabin, "There is much more fun in education if you use it." A Roman banquet does give ample opportunity to put into use much of the information gleaned from classroom activities, textbooks, and collateral reading; it also resurrects Roman civilization in a vivid and unforgettable manner, and so is in keeping with even Will Durant's idea of "What Education is of Most Worth," much as he may have pained our Latin-loving hearts with his statement: "There is but one decent thing to do with a dead language—bury it. I would spare my pupils Greek, but not Greece; I would bury Latin, but resurrect Roman civilization."

In brief, some of the objectives achieved by a Roman banquet are that

1. It furnishes an exhibit of certain phases of the pupils' work and advertises the Latin department more widely than any other project.
2. It furnishes a Roman-life exhibit, a Roman-dress show, a display of classical dances, songs, and games to the community.
3. It furnishes a splendid opportunity for comparison with present-day situations, customs, and events.
4. It stimulates an appreciation of the Romans as real people, and some understanding of our debt to them.
5. It enlists the interest of the pupil, involves the use of association and apperception, appeals to the collecting, dramatization, play, and the like-to-do instincts.
6. It encourages the application of facts and procedures acquired in the study of Latin to Latin activities outside of class.
7. It develops habits of independent study, and inspires more extensive research and intensive study than any other project, since it necessitates the reading of books on Roman life, classical novels, translation of Latin stories, and the examination of textbooks not used in class. Thus it contributes to a knowledge of Roman family life, education, manner of living, dress, social life, classes of citizens, architecture, furniture, decorations, amusements, religion, customs, and foods.
8. It brings Rome to life and aids tremendously in "dehistorizing" the Romans. They become real persons and not mere names on a printed page when pupils actually experience Roman customs, dress, and food.
9. It contributes largely to historical and cultural background.
10. It gives functional rather than mechanical vocabulary drill.
11. It provides an opportunity to practice the speaking of Latin and trains in grasping the meaning of an entire sentence in its Latin order.
12. It creates wide-spread interest in the Latin department on the part of other pupils.
13. It creates a social atmosphere in the group of Latin students as a whole, and creates a feeling of unity in the department.
14. It teaches coöperation and the bearing of responsibility.

And now, detailed specifications for the banquet itself. Every fourth year a Roman banquet becomes a project for the entire Latin department. At first mention of it early in the fall the boys begin smacking their lips over the idea, and the girls begin to plan their costumes. No real Roman banquet in those ancient days could have stirred more excited anticipation or had more enthusiastic preparation than our banquets have.

As for expense, all freshmen pay twenty-five cents; sophomores, juniors, and seniors pay fifty cents. This covers most of the cost. So far, we have been fortunate in having someone donate a dressed pig and much of the other food. We have found that if we talk long, loudly, and widely enough about the banquet people become astonishingly interested in it, and volunteer

more coöperation than we actually need. As a reward we let them look on at the banquet; they come in droves and sit for three hours absorbing Roman atmosphere—and incidentally some of our food.

Our plans are made early in the semester and we work on them gradually, so that no great effort or hardship is realized at any time. I outline the entire banquet: the cost, food, costumes, decoration, and entertainment. Then I appoint committees, assign them their duties, meet them all together one afternoon of each week, and check on their progress. I give no information and do no work. I simply approve or refuse approval of the information and plans they submit. No individual pupil comes to me; the committees are responsible to all pupils. The costume committee is responsible for the selection of material for costumes, ordering of material, arrangement with dressmakers, information to pupils about every detail of dress, the making and furnishing of patterns, the draping of togas, etc. Just so, the other committees. I make contact with merchants, cooks, dressmakers, and all who help only through the committees.

By way of advance preparation, merchants order material for costumes and sell us at wholesale price; wholesale grocery houses quote us their best prices on all food; a restaurant is solicited to roast the pig at cost of fuel; florists promise flowers; dressmakers are engaged; dancing teachers train pupils for classical dances, both as solos and in groups; the physical education department starts getting certain Latin pupils in training for a wrestling match and boxing bout, and for juggling and acrobatic stunts; the band master and music department coöperate in training for flute solos and duets, organ music, Latin songs; two or three professional cooks are engaged, and six or eight mothers of pupils usually offer their services for kitchen duty; and a week in advance of the banquet pupils on their own initiative have spotted everything in the town that even looks Roman, and have been promised its use. In the Latin room a new vocabulary and a few sentences are put on the blackboard each week, and a few minutes' drill every day insures a speaking vocabulary and an understanding between guests and slaves, for all talking between them must be done in Latin. New words offer no difficulty to the most indifferent pupil when he knows that they are going to be put to good, functional, gustatory use.

One week before the banquet is given, the freshmen, who are slaves and do all the work of preparing the first course and of serving in every capacity, start their training. A very responsible freshman has been selected to serve as a sort of majordomo. He has two assistants, and the three of them train the slaves for their duties. The slaves are divided into groups: two girls, who agree to black their faces, are detailed to remove the sandals of the male guests and wash their feet; three girls carry in baskets of bread for every course; six or eight girls bring bronze bowls of perfumed water and towels after every course; a group of boys (the number being determined by the number of guests, for one boy can serve only six guests efficiently) brings in



the plates of food for every course. All slaves enter and leave the banquet hall, two and two, walking with all the dignity and precision of a wedding march. Two girls are assigned the duties of bringing in ivy wreaths and placing them on the heads of the male guests and of repeatedly coming in with atomizers and spraying perfume on favored Roman ladies. Four or more girls with blackened faces are assigned the task of standing behind important guests to fan them. Three boys are selected to serve at the wine (i.e., grape juice) bowl; one dips, while the other two serve the guests. If the kitchen is some distance from the banquet hall, another group of slaves, not in costume, carries food from the kitchen to the door of the hall, and still another group carries back the used plates. All slaves are trained so that their service is performed with the precision of clockwork. The majordomo announces the banquet to the host, and then takes his place between his two assistants. They stand at a vantage point behind a small table on which are a gong and a golden shrine with the figures of the Lares in it.

The day before the banquet the gymnasium is converted into a Roman peristyle with flowers and statuary in profusion. Tables are arranged in the shape of a rectangle minus one long side. The manual arts department builds a frame for a wide couch at the long side of the tables. This is covered with mattresses over which colorful spreads are placed. Dressing table seats are placed at the sides of the table for the girls. No one sits at the inside of the tables; the service is from there and so is the entertainment.

When the final preparations are completed, the room is lighted by candles in floor candelabra; the tables are covered with heavy white paper cut to fit; only silver and crystal are used on the table; silver baskets for flowers, crystal bowls for fruit, silver candelabra with white tapers, crystal dishes with ripe olives, figs, pickled cucumbers and onions, radishes, cheese. Great garlands of ivy are looped around the table on the inside and around the wine bowl. The wine bowl is placed midway in front of the table occupied by the boys and is directly in front of the host.

The first course is on the table. Now the banquet begins. The majordomo announces the dinner, then walks back to his place. The guests flock in: girls in captivating costumes of white and pastel tints, ribbons and ornaments in their hair, wearing make-up and jewelry to their heart's content, and with their pink toes peeping out from sandals; the boys in their white togas—many of them with the crimson stripe and red shoes. They find their places designated by place cards cut in the shape of Roman water jugs or Roman figures. All are seated and the first course is eaten. Slaves remove the plates, water and towels are brought, used, and carried out. Then the host bids his guests stand. The majordomo and his attendants advance with great ceremony bearing the shrine with its gods and silver containers for the salt, meal, and wine. The household gods are invoked, and then the guests are reseated and the courses of food progress.

Entertainment and conversation are going on constantly and the slaves in

their brown tunics are moving in and out, intent on their duties. The majordomo keeps constant watch over all proceedings and sends his two attendants to smooth out any difficulties that arise. When the time comes for the roasted pig to be served, the majordomo and his two attendants leave the hall and return, preceded by two flutists who play continuously until the pig has been carved and served. The majordomo carries the pig over his head on a great silver platter, his attendants bear silver serving dishes and a carving knife. The pig is placed before the host, the majordomo carves it, and his attendants serve all guests from the silver platters.

If the service, the entertainment, and the eating are properly synchronized the entire banquet can move along as smoothly as a well-planned pageant and prove as colorful and entertaining.

Our menu runs like this:

- First course: Stuffed half of egg on lettuce
- Second course: Oyster soup, crackers
- Third course: Fried fish, shredded cabbage, pickled onions, bread
- Fourth course: Fried chicken, beets, preserved figs, bread
- Fifth course: Roast duck, mushrooms, beans, bread
- Sixth course: Roast pig, asparagus tips, cinnamon apples, bread
- Seventh course: Tarts, cookies, grapes, pears, apples, nuts.

All during the banquet the slaves at the wine bowl are kept busy refilling glasses for the male guests; no Roman woman drinks more than one glass.

Our entertainment varies but usually consists of Grecian and Oriental dances; flute, trumpet, and organ solos or duets; humorous readings in Latin, or a mixture of Latin and English; juggling of apples; acrobatic stunts; a boxing bout and a wrestling match.

To add to our knowledge of historical background, one month before the banquet each pupil decides upon some character in Roman history—usually of the last days of the Republic—he wishes to represent and from that time on he gathers information about that person and his family. So at the banquet we find Caesar and Cicero, their political differences forgotten, engaged in friendly repartee; Pompey boasting of his victories; Crassus of his wealth; Catiline picking out senators for prey; handsome Clodius making Roman eyes at Pompeia; and always Cleopatra insists upon coming up from Egypt before her time.

GRACE ELMORE

DOBYNS-BENNETT HIGH SCHOOL  
KINGSPORT, TENNESSEE

## Current Events

---

[Edited by George E. Lane, Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass., for territory covered by the Association of New England and the Atlantic States; Dwight N. Robinson, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, for the Middle States east of the Mississippi River; G. A. Harrer, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., for the Southeastern States; Russell M. Geer, Tulane University, New Orleans, La., for the Lower Mississippi Valley and the Southwest; Alfred P. Dorjahn, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., and Franklin H. Potter, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia., for the Middle Western States. News from the Pacific Coast may be sent to Fred L. Farley, College of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif.]

This department will present everything that is properly news of general appeal, but considerations of space compel the editors to ask that items be made as brief as possible. Whenever feasible, it is preferable to print programs of meetings which would draw an attendance from a large area as live news in advance of the date rather than as dead news after the event. In this connection it should be remembered that the December issue, e.g., appears on November fifteenth and that items must be in hand five or six weeks in advance of the latter date.]

### The Classical Association of the Pacific States

The meeting of the Classical Association of the Pacific States was held with the Central Section at Leland Stanford, Junior, University on Saturday, November 2. The program consisted of two papers: Professor Lynn Townsend White, Jr., Stanford University (Medieval History), "Latin and the Tradition of Western Civilization"; and Professor Cornelia C. Coulter, Mount Holyoke College (Greek and Latin), "Some Problems in the Teaching of Latin as Seen by a Member of the New England Classical Association." Both were listened to with great interest and elicited a lively discussion.

At the business meeting Dr. Edna Landros was elected president. At the same time Dr. Alexander, of the University of California, was elected president and Mrs. Jane Rummel, of Oakland, California, secretary-treasurer of the Central Section.

### South Dakota

The South Dakota Classical Round Table met on November 25 at Aberdeen in conjunction with the fifty-eighth annual convention of the South Dakota Educational Association. Round-Table officers for this biennium were Emma Piersol, Dell Rapids, president; Doris Spieker, Mitchell, vice-president; Dolores Wood, Aberdeen, secretary. The program consisted of Latin songs by the

Group Singers, of Central High School, Aberdeen; "Our Latin Heritage," by Ann Smeland, Aberdeen; "Administrator's View of the Classics," Dr. N. E. Steele, president of Northern State Teachers' College and for a long time executive secretary of the South Dakota Education Association; "A Beginning Latin Teacher Speaks," Bernice Skaff, Lebanon; "Let's Talk It Over," Emma Wiken, Platte, and Margaret Hyde, Mitchell; "Report of the Louisville Meeting of the Classical Association," Harry G. Alwine, Dakota Wesleyan University; "Latin Teachers and the Professional Attitude," Dr. Grace Beede, University of South Dakota. On November 26 the Latin teachers met with the modern foreign language teachers at their annual joint luncheon.

The South Dakota Classical Association is sponsoring an "Activities Contest" this year for all high-school Latin students, according to an announcement of Principal C. C. Seeger, of Beresford. All schools that have not yet entered are urged to communicate with him at once.

#### Indiana—Fort Wayne

At a recent "Parents' Night" of the South Side High School, of Fort Wayne, the students of the Latin department, of which Miss Gertrude J. Oppelt is the head, gave to the guests present an interesting leaflet entitled *Life with Latin!* This contained testimonials to the value of Latin for the student of today, written by various prominent citizens of Fort Wayne, headed by Merle J. Abbott, superintendent of the schools of that city. This plan of enlisting the support of influential local citizens to promote a greater appreciation of the value of Latin study is a practical one which might be copied with profit by other schools.

#### New York—Fordham University

In conjunction with Fordham's Centenary Celebration, the Reverend Robert I. Gannon, S. J., President of the University, has announced that Virgil Thompson will compose the music for the production of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles, which will be presented in the original Greek at an outdoor production next May.

This production, which will require a cast of several hundred, is an outgrowth of a venture embarked upon last year, when students of the Classical Department of Fordham College gave the *Clouds* of Aristophanes in the college auditorium. This project was so successful that the performance had to be repeated, and authorities of the College felt that a more ambitious undertaking was merited. *Oedipus Tyrannus* will be presented on the terrace of Keating Hall, on Edwards Parade, in the evening, and a system of floodlights has been evolved which will make it a unique production.

The trend of the study of Greek in Fordham College has steadily gained intensity during the past few years. Although it is an elective subject in the freshman and sophomore classes, the enrolment this year has risen until almost one half of those eligible to take the subject have enrolled. It is be-

lieved that this percentage surpasses that of any college in the country with similar regulations, and next year it is planned to extend the elective to the junior class.

Thompson, the music-critic of the New York Herald-Tribune and an expert in dramatic music, wrote the scores for Gertrude Stein's "Four Saints in Three Acts" and the "Hamlet" of Leslie Howard.

Margaret Gage, famous for her work at the Bennett School, will assist in the interpretation of the choral music, and Eric Hawkins, the very capable coach of Kussevitzky's school last summer, will direct the chorus.

#### **Texas—The Latin Leaflet**

The *Latin Leaflet*, issued by the Department of Classical Languages of the University of Texas, is a booklet of some 60 pages which would repay study by those in other states who may be eager to do something for the cause of Latin. The last issue bears the date of August 8, 1940, and the subtitle, *Tournament Number for 1940-1941*.

After an introductory page on the reasons for studying Latin, especially now, when America is called upon to take up that intellectual leadership so recently abandoned by Europe, one finds the program of the Second Texas Latin Teachers' Institute and a condensed report of Professor Dorrance S. White's lecture, delivered before the Institute, on "How to Make Caesar Interesting." This is followed (pp. 14-36) with very specific information about the Tournament. Names of pupils and schools that have won in the past are given along with very definite instructions to teachers and pupils about how to prepare to win in the future. The booklet ends with word lists for all grades, reviews of books that would be acceptable for classical libraries in high schools, and the examinations that had been used April 6, 1940.

This is all very stimulating and very directly helpful to ambitious teachers of Latin throughout the state, who find the Tournament just what they needed to keep both them and their pupils vitally interested. Of course the great thrill comes when the announcements of victory are made at the annual banquet, but this one must feel rather than write about it.

The *Leaflet* may be obtained from University Publications, University of Texas, Austin, at ten cents per copy.

#### **Classical Association of Virginia**

The annual autumn meeting of the Classical Association of Virginia was held November 22 at the Hotel John Marshall, Richmond, Va. The chief papers were: "Latin in Today's Democracy," by Ruth O. Wofford, of Roosevelt High School, Washington, D.C., and "The Enrichment of the Latin Classes," by H. C. Bradshaw, of Emporia High School. The next meeting will be held at Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va.

The officers for this and next year are: A. D. Fraser, president; Anne M. Owen, vice-president; Mrs. Burnett Miller, Jr., secretary; Mrs. W. E. Meade, treasurer.



**Oklahoma Classical Council**

The members of the Oklahoma Classical Council met in Norman November 16 in the Union Building on the campus of the University of Oklahoma under the direction of the president, Dr. Mary R. Bell, of Oklahoma College for Women, Chickasha. At the business meeting Mrs. Louise S. Johnson, of the University Preparatory School and Junior College, Tonkawa, was elected corresponding secretary, and Miss Ann Dawson, of the Horace Mann Junior High School, Tulsa, was elected treasurer. Miss Frances Gossett was appointed by the Executive Board to represent the Central district for the remainder of the term. Using the old Roman method of deciding many issues, lots were drawn to determine the length of term of the various district representatives. According to the Fates the three-year terms fell to the representatives of the Northwestern, Northeastern, and Southwestern districts; the two-year terms to the representatives of Oklahoma City, Panhandle, and Southeastern districts; the one year terms to Central, Northern, and East Central district representatives. As the successors to the present incumbents are elected, they will have three-year terms.

A motion was also passed to send a note of appreciation to Miss Etta Hikes, who is retiring at the end of this school year after forty-seven years of Latin teaching in the Guthrie High School.

Miss Isabel Work, of Southeastern State College, Durant, who is state chairman of the National Committee on the Present Status of Classical Education, presented a report comparing the enrolment in Latin classes in 1935-36 with that of the past year, 1939-40. A study of the data shows that more students are taking Latin in thirty-three high schools and that fewer are taking Latin in twenty-nine high schools. The figures of increase and decrease in many cases are so small that they are not indicative of trends—merely incidents of enrolment.

The main speech was an informal talk by Mr. R. J. Edwards, of Oklahoma City, who talked about methods and attitudes of presenting Latin to students. Some of his points were:

The thought and feeling of a Latin author cannot be gained through a translation. One needs a knowledge of the original tongue.

Read Robert Graves' *I, Claudius* and Norman Douglas' *Old Calabria* for background.

Require pupils to learn by heart Latin versions of the Lord's prayer, the beatitudes, some songs, etc. The phrases of these will give the pupils some Latin they are sure of.

What if Latin does have a reputation of being hard. So do mathematics and many other subjects in the curriculum.

Teach Latin sentences not as a puzzle but as literature.

Compare some of the Latin authors with modern authors, e.g., Tertullian with Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath*.

Read what Pliny has to say about the Christians.

Get the Martial class to imagine they are having a fireside chat with the satirist.

Stress reading at sight. A necessary preliminary step for this is a thorough knowledge of forms and their uses.

Let no one after five years of Latin omit Greek.



In conclusion Mr. Edwards said that his friends often expressed pity for him and could not understand why he continued to take Latin all through his college career. He acknowledged that he was, perhaps, a freak. But that, for him, it was fun and easy. He stoutly denied that he had ever been a grind. He considers the results are not only esthetical but practical.

The opportunities to be derived from membership in the Classical Association of the Middle West and South and in the American Classical League were presented by Dr. Jessie D. Newby, state chairman for both organizations.

Dr. and Mrs. O. W. Reinmuth received the Council in the afternoon at their home, 808 Elm Avenue.

## Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals

[Compiled by Professor Adolph Frederick Pauli and John William Spaeth, Jr.,  
of Wesleyan University.]

*The American Scholar* x (1940-1941).—(Winter: 84-93) Richard M. Gummere, "Scholar's Dilemma." The scholar is apprehensive lest in the secondary schools prospective scholars and intellectual leaders do not learn to use their essential tools. "No pupil of any promise should be destined to wake up at the age of 17 to find that his background of commercial English, social studies, general science, and practical arts has left him with no chance to enter a good college, no opening towards scholarship, and no ability to think uphill." (102-119) Roscoe Pound, "Life as the Guide of Philosophy." The author traces the development of skeptical and give-it-up philosophies in the Greek world during the Hellenistic era. He ascribes a similar skepticism today regarding absolute values to Neo-Kantian relativism. We need "a philosophy which believes life can be guided and seeks to guide it. The civilizations for which the give-it-up philosophies of the past were thought out broke down. They were guided by the life of the time and could of themselves give no real guidance."

*Bibliotheca Sacra* xcvi (1940).—(October-December: 476-481) J. L. Kelso, "A Résumé of Recent Archaeological Research." The author is attempting "to give a skeleton outline of the present state of biblical archaeology in Palestine and related countries." His résumé deals with research since the First World War.

*Books Abroad* xiv (1940).—(Autumn: 347-352) William L. Bailey, "On Translating the Gospels." The purpose of the article is to explain that the author is answering "a major need for a translation of the Gospels into what might be called 'journalese'."

*The Connoisseur* cvi (1940).—(September: 102-105) D. B. Harden, "Roman Mould-Blown Glasses." An historical account illustrated with twelve photographic illustrations of glass objects. The author narrates the spread of the industry throughout the Roman world from its beginning, probably, in Syria in the early part of the first century after Christ.

*Ethics* li (1940).—(October: 49-65) G. Stanley Whitey, "Nature and Morality." In his discussion of "a morality based on the concept of nature" the author gives considerable attention to the Stoic and "Socratic" views. (66-101) Richard McKeon, "Plato and Aristotle as Historians: A Study of

Method in the History of Ideas." "Neither Plato nor Aristotle wrote as historians, and neither of them is a source of strictly historical information. Both, as philosophers, tried to relate the philosophers they quoted not to times and circumstances, but to the truth; and the numerous differences in the information concerning what other men had said and their use of it in the statement of their own philosophies result from differences in their conceptions of truth and the means by which to attain it. . . . As historical statements their virtues are contrary to one another, for Plato's treatment of his predecessors, when accurate, enables one to recover the spirit of a philosopher and in that sense to understand him, while Aristotle's treatment, when accurate, enables one to recover the statements of a philosopher and in that sense to understand him."

*The Germanic Review* xv (1940).—(October: 159–180) Virginia Gingerick, "The *Ludus Diane* of Conrad Celtes." Celtes was a productive scholar in the field of classical literature and learning. He discovered and published the works of Hroswitha. His Latin play, *Ludus Diane*, "has elements of a classical comedy in its outward appearance and a mediaeval pageant in its loose feeling for dramatic action." The text and musical scores of the play are given at the end of the article.

*Hispanic Review* viii (1940).—(October: 339–342) Otis H. Green, "A Note on Spanish Humanism: Sepúlveda and His Translation of Aristotle's *Politics*." Testimony regarding the translation is cited.

*Hobbies* xlv (1940).—(December: 91 f) "Hadrian—A.D. 117–138." This contains a "brief account of a few of the coins of Hadrian . . . by Joseph Coffin, of New York."

*The Huntington Library Quarterly* iv (1940).—(October: 1–25) Albert Hyma, "The Continental Origins of English Humanism." This analysis of the influence of Italian humanism in England from 1450 to 1600 should be of interest to students of the revival of classical learning.

*The Journal of Theological Studies* xli (1940).—(July–October: 253–260) C. C. Tarelli, "The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Western and Byzantine Texts." This is a detailed discussion of readings. Special attention is given to the peculiarities of D. The Chester Beatty Papyrus "has increased the difficulty of segregating pure 'Western' or pure 'Syrian' readings."

*Language* xvi (1940).—(October–December: 273–284) Edgar H. Sturtevant, "The Greek  $\kappa$ -Perfect and Indo-European  $-k(o)-$ ." "The formative  $-\kappa a$  of Gk.  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\kappa a$  'I stand' and Toch.  $t\acute{a}k\bar{a}$  'I was' must contain the Indo-Hittite 1st sg. perfect ending  $-xa$ ."

*The Library Quarterly* x (1940).—(October: 494–531) Ernest G. Schwiebert, "Remnants of a Reformation Library." "Although there is little direct evidence that Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon had much to do with the

building-up of the library, it is highly interesting that while they were transforming the University of Wittenberg from a scholastic institution in which the *via antiqua* and *via moderna* were dominant into one of biblical humanism, the university library should also reflect this basic change. . . . The fact that the classics, and the Church Fathers, and the humanists were so well represented seems to point conclusively to the fact that the Reformers valued and employed Renaissance tools in the restoration of early Christianity." There is one photographic illustration.

*Life* ix (1940).—(November 18: 106–108) "Italian Bombers Menace Priceless Art of Ancient Athens and Its Acropolis." Seven photographic illustrations are accompanied by a brief note. (December 9: 93 f) "Antique Jewelry at Museum Show Has a Modern Look." A brief note and four photographic illustrations, three of which show a model wearing ancient jewelry belonging to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City.

*Michigan Alumnus* XLVI (1939).—(No. 10: 9–19) Campbell Bonner, PAULI "Sophocles, Aristotle, and the Tired Business Man."

*Modern Language Quarterly* I (1940).—(September: 383–391) Irene Samuel, "The Influence of Plato on Sir Philip Sidney's *Defense of Poesy*." We may properly say that Sidney's purpose "is to reconcile Platonism, the accuser, with the function and form of poetry, the accused. We may go further and say that Plato's word is the main source of Sidney's *Defense of Poesy*. . . . Sidney has tried the poet by the standard which Plato set, and has found him, of all who may be tried by that standard, most able to perform the Platonic function of leading men to that virtue and happiness which a knowledge of truth bestows."

*Modern Philology* XXXVIII (1940).—(November: 113–132) Sanford B. Meech, "A Collection of Proverbs in Rawlinson MS D 328." The manuscript, "an *omnium gatherum*" originally owned by Walter Pollard, a citizen of Plymouth in the 15th century, includes a collection of eighty-three "proverbs and aphoristic sayings, each one in a Latin and an English version." The present article includes a transcription of the text.

*More Books* (Bulletin of the Boston Public Library) xv (1940).—(September: 290 f.) M. M., "A London Edition of Proclus and Ptolemy." Description of a volume published in London in 1620, with translations by John Bainbridge. (October: 336) M. M., "An Early French Josephus." Description of a folio volume, *Antiquitez des Juifz*, translated by Guillaume Michel (Paris, 1534), "apparently the first edition of the work." (November: 355–379) Zoltán Haraszti, "Early Books of Augsburg and Ulm." Description of nineteen incunabula owned by the Boston Public Library and "all acquired within the last three years."

*Musical Quarterly* xxvi (1940).—(October: 494–528) Higini Anglès, "Hispanic Musical Culture from the 6th to the 14th Century."

*Near East Service Quarterly* i (1940).—(October: 5–7) Sven Larsen, "The Seven Churches in Asia Minor." Brief historical sketch and description of remains of Smyrna, Pergamon, and Ephesus, accompanied by four photographic illustrations. (11–13) "Sophiote—Sophia." History and description of this Balkan city, ancient Serdica, an important center in the Roman period. Four photographic illustrations.

*Philological Quarterly* xix (1940).—(October: 321–327) Roy C. Flickinger, "Aristotle's *Poetics* 1460b 15–26." Proposed emendations of the text based on the "theory that certain kinds of textual errors originated at the period when MSS were copied in narrow columns . . . of capital letters without spaces between the words." (337–342) Alfred P. Dorjahn, "Demosthenes' Reply to the Charge of Cowardice." Instead of trying, in the *De Corona*, to answer directly Aeschines' charge of cowardice (at Chaeronea), Demosthenes "employed the simple but effective device of making the dicasts forget all about it or ignore it," by emphasizing his courage and activity as a statesman. Translated passages from Demosthenes and Aeschines listed, in illustration. (328–336) Carl Selmer, "A Latin Collection of Pseudo-Aristotelian *Paraenimiai* and Its Relation to the *Sayings of the Seven Sages*." (400–404) Harry E. Wedeck, "A Mediaeval Catullus: Ioannes Secundus." A brief essay on the erotic poetry of the sixteenth-century Latin poet, with special attention to his "mastery of the Catullan technique."

*Quarterly Journal of Speech* xxvi (1940).—(October: 397–400) Hayes A. Newby, "An Etymological Study of Twelve Passages of Oratory." Questioning a statement made in a recent *Handbook of Broadcasting*, that "words of Anglo-Saxon origin are stronger than those with a foreign base," the author studied the word content of twelve oratorical selections, Burke to Elihu Root. It was found "that the percentage of Latin derivatives is much greater in the case of the meaningful words than in the case of all words," the respective averages being 44 per cent and 20 per cent as compared with 46 per cent and 74 per cent respectively for native English words. "In the examples of forceful speech studied, it was found that on the average the speakers used a greater number of meaningful words of foreign extraction than of native origin."

*School and Society* lxi (1940).—(October 26: 396–398) Arthur F. Engelbert, "Foreign Languages as a Vital Factor in Foreign Propaganda Control." The advisability of a shift of emphasis in the teaching of foreign languages: "There is a much broader significance to foreign-language instruction of which the public is not aware and which language staffs have lamentably failed to

demonstrate." B. L. Ullman is quoted with approval. (November 30: 549 f.) "A Classicist and a Business Man on Educational Needs." Brief digest of addresses delivered by B. L. Ullman and James D. Mooney before the seventh annual Foreign Language Conference sponsored by the New York University School of Education, November 17.

SPAETH